THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

L. XLIII. No. 253 JULY, 1941

The Training of the Village Priest - *H. L. Hubbard*
The Religion of Spiritualists—I - *W. K. Lowther Clarke*
The Lachish Excavations - - - *H. F. D. Sparks*
Coventry Patmore's Theology of the Incarnation - - - - *Richard de Bary*
The Future of Sunday - - - *H. A. Mess*
The Church and Evacuation - - *S. M. Gibbard*
New Testament Survey - - - *L. J. Collins*

For full list of contents see within.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Edited by Alec R. Vidler at St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Chester, and published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

s. per copy. 12s. per annum, post free.

THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, B.D., St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Chester. (MSS should not exceed 4,000 words, and should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.)
Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Advisory Committee

The Rev. Canon F. A. Cockin.
The Rev. L. J. Collins.
The Rev. F. L. Cross, D.Phil.
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.
Ashley Sampson.

33272

Collaborators

(The following are in general sympathy with the aims of *Theology* and are willing in various ways to give it their assistance, but they are not committed by the editorial policy in particular matters.)

The Rev. H. K. Archdall.
Montgomery Belgion.
The Rev. Canon J. S. Bezzant, B.D.
Prof. T. S. R. Boase.
F. Brittain.
Leonard Browne, M.D.
Miss K. E. Chester.
The Rev. A. A. Cock.
The Rev. F. N. Davey.
The Rev. H. S. Deighton.
E. W. Edmonds.
T. S. Eliot.
Miss D. M. Emmet.
Bro. George Every, S.S.M.
The Rev. A. M. Farrer.
The Rev. S. L. Greenslade.
The Rev. Prof. L. W. Grensted, D.D.
The Rev. H. StJ. Hart.
The Rev. H. C. L. Heywood.
The Rev. Prof. Leonard Hodgson, D.D.
Prof. M. V. C. Jeffreys.
The Rev. Canon W. L. Knox, B.D.
The Rev. F. E. P. S. Langton.
The Very Rev. the Provost of Leicester.
C. S. Lewis.
The Rev. Prof. R. H. Lightfoot, D.D.
The Rev. Ronald Lunt.
Donald Mackinnon.
The Rev. Prof. F. S. Marsh.
The Rev. E. L. Mascall.
The Rev. Guy Mayfield.
The Rev. F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.
The Rev. T. R. Milford.
J. Middleton Murry.
The Rev. Arnold Nash, M.Sc.
Joseph Needham, Sc.D., F.R.S.
The Rev. A. Otter.
The Rev. Prof. O. C. Quick, D.D.
The Rev. Prof. A. M. Ramsey.
The Rev. E. C. Ratcliff.
The Rev. Alan Richardson, B.D.
Michael Roberts.
The Very Rev. the Dean of St Paul's.
The Rev. George Seaver, B.D.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Sheffield.
John Short.
The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.
The Rev. A. M. Stockwood.
The Rev. Prof. R. V. G. Tasker, B.D.
Miss B. Hamilton Thompson.
The Rev. Oliver Tomkins.
The Rev. C. D. Waddams.
Gilbert N. Walton.
The Rev. M. A. C. Warren.
Charles Williams.
The Headmaster of Winchester.

Editorial Representatives in U.S.A. (to whom MSS and communications from American writers should be sent):

The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, New York.
The Rev. Powel M. Dawley, Ph.D., St David's Church, Roland Park, Baltimore

Collaborators in U.S.A.

Prof. George R. Elliott, Litt.D.
The Rev. Canon John Crocker. [S.T.D.
The Very Rev. Hughell E. W. Fosbroke,
The Rev. Leicester C. Lewis, S.T.D
The Rev. Charles W. Lowry, D.Phil.
Prof. William A. Orton.
Allen Tate.

Other Representatives Abroad:

Ireland: The Rev. Prof. R. R. Hartford, B.D., Trinity College, Dublin.
South Africa: The Rev. C. H. S. Runge, C.R., Rosettenville, Johannesburg.
N. India: The Rev. J. R. Peacey, Bishop's College, Calcutta.
S. India: The Ven. T. G. Stuart Smith, C.M.S., Tholashery, Tiruvalla, Travancore.
Australia: The Rev. G. Stuart Watts, 90 Pitt Street, Sydney.
Japan: The Rev. C. K. Sansbury, Central Theological College, Tokyo.
Canada: The Rev. R. K. Naylor, Diocesan Theological College, Montreal.

THEOLOGY

VOL. XLIII JULY, 1941 No. 253

The Training of the Village Priest

THIS article needs to be prefaced by a personal explanation and apology. The writer is not a village priest, but a townsman who is serving a village cure for the duration of the war. The months of his country experience fall far short of the years of village ministry spent by the great majority of his brethren. It is only because the onlooker sometimes sees most of the game that he is encouraged to essay so impertinent a task as to write about the training of those country clergy for whom he has learnt to have a profound admiration. Further encouragement has come from a suggestion that he should attempt it made to him by one whose authority he must perforce acknowledge.

Attention to this vital subject has recently been drawn by the Report of a Committee appointed by the Bishop of Winchester (*The Church in Country Parishes:* S.P.C.K., 2s.). There is much in this report of very great value and importance, both for the authorities who are responsible for ecclesiastical administration and for those who have to exercise the Church's ministry in country parishes. There is no need to go over the ground ably covered by this report. Our concern is to make some attempt to deal with one subject which the committee has mentioned, but without bringing forward many suggestions to bear upon it. Yet who can doubt that the training of the village priest is fundamental to the whole problem of the Church's work in country parishes?

I

At the present moment, in the majority of our country parishes the position of the Church is little short of deplorable. (The committee's report suggests this without actually

stating it.) The attendance at divine worship is about as low as it has ever been. Holy Communion is attended spasmodically by about two or three per cent. of the population. These are unusual days, and may be responsible for unusual results, though it is always easy to put forward as reasons what may really be excuses. It is true that the situation is equally bad, or perhaps even worse, in town parishes, though it is not so obvious. In the towns, moreover, the parish priest does not enjoy the same opportunities for personal contact with his flock as his brother in the country does. In so far as "church absence" is the parson's fault (and this is only part of the reason), while the town priest should say *mea culpa*, his village brother must exclaim *mea maxima culpa* !

Yet he is not entirely to blame. He wages a losing battle because for the most part he is ill, or inadequately, equipped for the fight. He is, usually, a townsman by training. He has probably spent the best years of his ministry in a town parish, and comes into the country only when he is worn out or at an age when he cannot readily adapt himself to a new outlook and a new way of life. The following statistics from the writer's own diocese speak for themselves.

In the diocese of Canterbury there are roughly three hundred parishes. Of these, one hundred and thirty have a population of less than a thousand, and another seventy number between one and three thousand inhabitants. That is to say, two-thirds of the parishes in the diocese may be described as village or country cures. Two hundred and twenty of them are served by single-handed priests. In the whole diocese the numbers of country and town priests (including assistant clergy) are almost equal; but *ninety-five per cent. of the country clergy began their ministry in town parishes.* It is not to be supposed that the Canterbury diocese is in any way different from many others which contain both rural and urban parishes. The significant fact is that both rural and urban parishes (with a negligible number of exceptions) are served by clergy who are townsmen. This is, in the writer's opinion, one of the most serious factors in the contemporary English religious scene.

It is, of course, true to say in mitigation of the seriousness of the situation that to a large extent our country parishes have become increasingly urbanized. The village of half a century ago hardly exists to-day. The people have drifted

into the towns, and those who remain are affected by such urbanizing influences as the improvement of transport, education, the press and the wireless have put in their way. How far this phase of village history is transitory and how far permanent remains to be seen. After the war there may be, please God there will be, a drift back to the land, there to inaugurate, under the impulse of the " new farming ", another chapter in English rural life. The Church must be prepared for this movement, and must set herself to the task of discovering vocations to the rural ministry and the training of men to become the next generation of village priests.

II

What manner of man should the country parson be ? and what are the marks of this special vocation ?

Consider first what will be expected of him. He must be a man of God, given to prayer and devotion. Nothing is easier than for a country priest to grow slack in his own spiritual life. The lack of support from his people, the multiplicity of tasks to which he must give himself for lack of sufficient lay help, his isolation from his brother-clergy, combine to make a serious assault upon his prayer-life. He should be a man who can find his interests, his hobbies and his occupation in the life of the countryside. He must fit into his background. He must put aside all desire for the limelight, and be content with little things. He must be able, without losing his personal and priestly dignity, to put himself alongside his rural flock in all their concerns. Without yielding to the temptation of scholarship at the cost of pastoral labours, he should be able to keep the wells of his mental and spiritual life filled by reading and study. He must be patient, not easily discouraged, and sympathetic. He must not dragoon but love his people into the Kingdom of God.

These qualifications of the country parson suggest also the marks of his vocation. There must be as strong a conviction that he is called to this work as that which a missionary or a religious experiences. Much can be done by the present generation of country parsons to foster such vocations among the young men in their parishes; for *ceteris paribus* the country-bred lad will ultimately make the best village priest. Country priests of to-day who are

conscious of their own failures can in this way do something to ensure that their successors are more fitted than themselves for this hard and difficult vocation. Having discovered a young man with a vocation to the country priesthood, the next thing is to train him.

III

The training of a village priest cannot begin too early, for it is as much, even more, concerned with the education of his spirit as with his intellect. Here the country parson of to-day can give invaluable help. He can start the aspirant for holy orders on his way while he is still a boy at school. Not only can he help him in his studies, but he can begin to open out before him something of the spirit of the priesthood. He can employ him in the church and parish, and can show him something of the significance of the ordered life of priestly devotion. Above all, he can set an example of a faithful, humble, priestly life.

The specialized education of a priest is passing through a period of experiment and change in the Church of England. The old approach to the ministry by way of the university and the theological college still remains open to those who, in ever-dwindling numbers, can afford it. Others reach their ordination after a longer period spent at such institutions as Kelham or Mirfield. Some, especially those who bring to a late ordination some experience gained in another walk of life, are allowed to replace the university training by a longer period at a theological college. If we regard Kelham and Mirfield as theological colleges (though the Mirfield training includes some time spent at Leeds University), we may say that the three important factors in a priest's training are the university, the theological college and his title for ordination.

At the university the aspirant for the village priesthood should read for an arts degree—in theology or in any other subject. He should attend some professorial lectures in divinity as well. Amongst these lectures he will probably attend some on pastoral theology. Here it may not be out of place to plead with the university authorities to arrange, at more frequent intervals than at present, for pastoral lectures dealing with the rural ministry. At Oxford there is a Professor of Pastoral Theology, and at Cambridge a Lecturer is appointed annually. Is it an impertinence to

suggest to them that they have constantly in mind the fact that among the ordinands who attend their lectures at least half are destined to become country parsons ?

After the university comes the theological college. Here again the emphasis is overwhelmingly upon the needs of the town parishes. This is perhaps inevitable, since the titles for the majority of ordinands are derived from the urban parishes. The emphasis is made the greater whenever the glamour of pastoral work in great cities is exaggerated at the expense of the rural ministry.

There are some twenty-three Anglican theological colleges in England, and four that are devoted to training men for work in the Church overseas. Is it too much to suggest that at least as many colleges be set aside to train men exclusively for the sacred ministry in our English villages as for missionary work abroad ?

This training should, as at present, fall under the two headings of intellectual and devotional. The curriculum need not be very different, though the emphasis in all the teaching will be towards those subjects which are most likely to be of use to the country priest. Besides his biblical and dogmatic theology he should be given a good deal of practical training in pastoralia and homiletics. Liturgiology and the conduct of services in village churches are of first importance. He should also have some knowledge of such secular matters as are likely to come his way in the exercise of his ministry—rural government, school management and even such homely and practical concerns as carpentry and plumbing, home nursing and gardening. He should be ready not only to live himself without many of the amenities which a town would put at his door, but also to lend a hand to his neighbours in all the many mundane happenings of domestic life. Who shall say that such things are unspiritual or outside the purview of any minister of God and man ?

More important still is the would-be village priest's training in the spiritual life. The Bishop of Winchester's committee truly says, " The spiritual vitality of a parish is intimately bound up with the inner life of the parson." The foundations of his spiritual life must be well and truly laid in the theological college. The immediate objective is the formation of devotional habits which will stand the priest in good stead when the days of testing come. The framework of priestly devotion must be the Divine Office, medita-

tion, intercession, and whenever possible the Holy Eucharist. Of these the first is likely to be the most difficult to maintain in the midst of a rural ministry. Meditation should be helped by the leisure and quiet which is God's special gift to the village priest; and intercession for his people is not so liable to be overloaded with subjects as is his brother's in the town parish. But the Office must often be said alone and frequently in his study when the weather almost prohibits the use of the church. Only a priest who has come to appreciate the sense of spiritual fellowship which the regular recitation of his Office brings to him will be able to persevere faithfully in this duty. It will help him enormously if, at his theological college, he not only begins to form the habit of saying the Office but also makes these ancient devotions the subject of prayerful and intellectual study. No emphasis can be too strong which is laid upon the importance of the village priest's personal life of prayer. His ministry at the altar must to a very large extent depend upon the conditions of his parish, but his aim must always be to celebrate the Divine Mysteries for his people as often as circumstances permit. It is there that he will find the necessary inspiration and grace for his life and ministry.

Let us suppose that our aspirant has finished his time at a theological college. Next he has to find a title for ordination. Here is a difficulty which bids fair to frustrate all the training he may previously have received. To find a country parish which can support an assistant curate for the first years of his ordained life is at present an almost insuperable problem. Yet if the Church is prepared to attack this vitally important concern as seriously as it deserves she must make it possible for the young ordinand to begin his ministry in a rural parish. If the diocese can guarantee his stipend, wholly or in part, it might be done. The present writer would suggest the setting aside of certain country parishes in every diocese as training-grounds for village priests. It would be the responsibility of the bishop to appoint to these benefices incumbents whom he considered capable of the oversight of a deacon or a junior priest. The income of the benefice might be paid to the diocesan treasury, from which, after any necessary augmentation, the stipends of both the incumbent and the newly ordained deacon or priest would be paid. In many country parishes both clergy might live together in the vicarage house.

IV

There is one other important factor in the training of a country parson to be considered. The besetting temptation of most priests who work in lonely places seems to be that of " running to seed ". Very easily does the standard of priestly life and obligation become relaxed. This is not unknown among town clergy, but in the country the stimulus which urban life supplies is often lacking. Who does not know the country parson who began his ministry with high hopes and ideals and has gradually let them slip away from him, while he has grown uninterested in his work and has possibly allowed himself to " get across " his people ? Is there anything, save by the man's own effort and the grace of God, which can be done to prevent this tragic situation arising ?

The Bishop of Winchester's committee rightly emphasizes the importance of the priest's Rule of Life and makes some eminently practical suggestions to that end. This is excellent as far as it goes; but it is in danger of being nullified if it does not tackle the problem of loneliness, which is the major cause of a country priest's failure. It ought not to be impossible for a group of neighbouring priests to associate with each other in the keeping of a common Rule. They could agree together upon its contents and by regular meetings stimulate one another to its more faithful observance. Lack of space prevents the elaboration of this idea, but it seems capable of going some way towards raising the whole standard of life and practice among the country clergy.

The problem of the country parson is vital and cannot be shelved without grave detriment to the work of the Church in more than half the parishes in the land. It is incredible that it has been allowed to reach its present serious proportions; it would be preposterous if the Church made no real attempt to solve it. Too long has the reform been overdue. This present moment, in view of the changes which are implicit in the days to come, is the time when it must be faced. To an extent not always realized the country parson holds the key to the whole question of the future of English religion. Let him at least be properly trained and equipped for his task.

H. L. HUBBARD.

The Religion of Spiritualists—I

I—PSYCHICAL RESEARCH

Psychical research is now so widely recognized as a department of science that its main results may be assumed. It is very difficult, because the material with which it works is the powers, often liable to wane and in any case intermittent, of certain exceptional persons—not inanimate things—so that the experiments, in the nature of the case, cannot be exactly repeated. The fraud associated with Spiritualism should not make us conclude that scientific men who devote their lives to psychical research are the victims of cheating, hallucination, and defective powers of observation. Most of us have had mild psychical experiences (or else can trust the testimony of friends), which incline us to give credence to the more remarkable experiences recorded in books. I shall therefore assume the genuineness of many phenomena both (*a*) objective and (*b*) subjective.[1] They may be classified as follows:

(*a*) 1. Raps are produced, making a table vibrate in a resonant way bearing no resemblance to the cracking of toe- or knee-joints, by which sceptics explain them.

2. Haunted houses exist; the evidence for poltergeists is particularly strong.

3. Phantasms are credibly attested. They are especially frequent at the moment of death and during the year following, after which they become rare.

4. Lights are seen at séances, which are clearly derived from the medium and in favourable circumstances concentrate into a substance called ectoplasm, from which hands, rods, or even materializations of complete forms, are produced. The last-named, however, are rare under test conditions, and some investigators are not convinced.

5. Objects are moved at a distance from the medium, even sometimes when enclosed by solid barriers, the most plausible explanation being that the ectoplasmic material, which at this stage is invisible, can exercise muscular power.

(*b*) 1. The faculty of automatic writing is common. The knowledge shown in the scripts of a medium in a trance is sometimes such as cannot be reasonably ascribed to tele-

[1] Two books recommended are C. Richet, *Thirty Years of Psychical Research* (1923), and Harry Price, *Fifty Years of Psychical Research* (1940).

pathic communication from living personalities. Like crystal-gazing, this is a method of tapping one's subconscious self, through which it is alleged an external personality may act.

2. Clairvoyance is equally common. The powers shown by some people of reading thoughts, guessing the contents of a sealed envelope, or with the help of a divining rod detecting deeply-buried water or metals, are far beyond what can be accounted for by chance. The human mind has faculties of acquiring knowledge other than the five senses.

3. The medium in a trance often speaks with different voices. In some cases he shows a knowledge of foreign, even dead, languages, unknown to him in the waking state. The technical term for this is " xenoglossy ".

4. A particularly puzzling phenomenon is precognition, going far beyond the vague premonitions with which we are all familiar.

Direct voices, when the medium speaks in tones not his own and, it is alleged, without his lips moving, are on the border-line of (*a*) and (*b*). " Apports ", objects brought into the room when all possible precautions have been taken, are perhaps doubtful. " Spirit photography " is, to an exceptional extent, associated with fraud, but the evidence in some cases is hard to resist.

I take it as proved that mediums sometimes have access to knowledge which cannot be explained by ordinary theories of telepathy. That a secondary personality (well known in the annals of abnormal psychology) is functioning is no doubt a correct explanation; but the problem is only removed one stage back. It is often said that the medium draws upon some kind of cosmic consciousness or race-memory, but this is harder to believe than the simpler theory of the continued activity of departed human beings. For what could be more incredible than that the trance personality of a medium should go into a universal repository of knowledge and pick out just what interests an individual sitter, in some cases pieces of information which that sitter verifies only after long-continued research ?

The reality of the phenomena generally is guaranteed by the fact that substantially the same results are obtained by investigators in many lands. This would be impossible if the fraudulent actions of independent cheaters were the explanation. In the same way the apparent purposelessness of true ghost stories, so different from anything that would ensure publication in a magazine, attests their genuineness.

II—GENESIS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

I have been reasonably familiar with the literature of psychical research for the last thirty years, and have been inclined to look indulgently upon Spiritualism. When, in 1940, the committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1937 to examine the subject presented its report, the Archbishop decided that no good purpose would be served by publishing what was intended for his private information. The Spiritualist press then declared that the Church had suppressed a report which summed up in favour of Spiritualism. This drew my attention to the subject afresh and I realized that I knew virtually nothing about Spiritualism, which may be considered as standing towards psychical research in the same relation as astrology to astronomy. The libraries gave little help; they had many books on psychical research, very few on Spiritualism as a religion.

At this point I met a Spiritualist. I said that, to the best of my belief, communications, if from the other world, came from earth-bound spirits who had nothing of importance to say. His reply was on these lines: I am no more interested than you would be in trivial messages from " Uncle Ted ". The enlightened Spiritualist pays attention rather to the rare communications from higher spirits; he is interested in the descriptions which they give of the building-up of the soul, begun in this life and continued hereafter; the rest is mostly worthless.

I then asked him to advise about books. There are, he explained, two types. First, those, written mostly by clergymen, which start from Christianity and try to show that Spiritualism is in accord with the Bible, or rather is its true explanation. Secondly, those which give the teaching of the spirits without trying to relate it to orthodox Christianity. For the first it would be sufficient to study the works of the Rev. C. L. Tweedale. For the second he recommended a number of books, which will be discussed in the sequel.

III—SPIRITUALISM AS AN ORGANIZED RELIGION

There are said to be more than 500 Spiritualist churches in Great Britain, besides innumerable gatherings in private houses. No prayer book is used. The hymnbooks con-

tain some hymns identical with those used elsewhere, often suitably changed, and many specially written for the movement. This service consists largely of hymns, for music is said to facilitate communications. The improvised prayers are concerned mainly with the blessings expected from the messages. The chairman introduces the speaker of the evening, who is a psychic. The speaker's ministrations are generally clairvoyant, consisting largely in the identification of spirit forms seen[1] round the heads of the audience and the delivery of messages from them. Or he may speak in " different " voices.

The beliefs which unite all Spiritualists are the existence of God, the survival of bodily death by human beings, and their power and willingness to communicate with the living. Other beliefs generally held are moral responsibility for actions on earth; universal progress for all souls after death except in cases where reincarnation is necessary; and the existence of a psychic or etheric body (double), which develops concurrently with the physical body and at death becomes the ready-made vehicle of the spirit. Christ is generally regarded as one of the higher spirits, who became divine through his receptivity. Spiritualists claim to possess a universal religion which explains all others, since the founders of the great religions were psychics.

Clergymen have taken a prominent place in the movement. The names of the Rev. Stainton Moses, the Rev. Vale Owen, and Archdeacon Colley, are familiar. The best known to-day is the Rev. C. L. Tweedale, whose two books *Man's Survival after Death* (1909) and *News from the Next World* (1940) deserve study. They are written with great enthusiasm, in a flowing style, and are full of marvels. To the critical reader Mr Tweedale seems to let his zeal run away with him. Trivial coincidences are twisted into wonders; the will to believe may manufacture evidence. But after making all reservations one must admit that Mr Tweedale, and still more his wife and daughters, are psychic to an unusual extent and have had experiences which they at least must take seriously. For the phenomena are spontaneous. What is one to do if apparitions visit one's house and disturb the ordinary routine? If messages come uninvited? When one's vocation is to call attention to the next world in the midst of a materialistic generation,

[1] Here and in future I dispense with the word " alleged ".

it is the line of least resistance to welcome what seems conclusive evidence of the reality of the next world.

Mr Tweedale's visitors, who generally manifested through automatic writing, sometimes signing their names in a manner more or less[1] resembling their signatures when on earth, included Stradivarius,[2] Chopin, Sir Robert Ball, Sir Hiram Maxim, Bishop Lightfoot, Cardinal Newman and Dr Pusey, Charlotte and Emily Brontë, and Tutankhamen.[3] The messages show that these famous people are greatly interested in Mr Tweedale but have practically nothing to tell us about the next world. That remarkable predictions were given is clear, but there is no evidence convincing to the doubter to link them with the particular persons to whom they are ascribed. However, the importance of Mr Tweedale's works for our purpose lies in his (typical) interpretation of the Bible.

The Bible as a Manual of Spiritualism

Such is the claim; the examples which follow are a selection of the more significant ones given in *Man's Survival after Death*. "The Bible is a book of visions, of apparitions, and of veridical dreams from beginning to end."

The prophets in the Old Testament are controlled by spirits (1 Sam. x, 6, xvi, 7; 1 Kings xxii, 21; 2 Kings iii, 15; Ezek. ii, 2, iii, 24). They fall into trances (so Balaam, in Num. xxiv, 4, "falling into a trance, but having his eyes open"; *cf.* Daniel's "deep sleep", Dan. viii, 18, x, 9). Materializations occur; see Gen. xxxii, 24, the man who wrestled with Jacob, and Josh. v, 13, 14, "the captain of the host of the Lord." In Dan. v, 5 a hand materializes; this is also an example of direct writing. Levitation is seen in 2 Kings vi, 6, the iron made to float, and Ezek. viii, 3, the prophet taken by a lock of his hair to Jerusalem. Radiance is attested in Exod. iii, 2, the burning bush, xiii, 21, the pillar of fire, and xxxiv, 30, the shining of Moses' face.

---

[1] Sometimes distinctly less; but we are shown the two signatures side by side, so that we can make our own comparisons. [2] Whose phantasm was constantly about the house. [3] Lest, through taking Mr Tweedale seriously, I should fail to be taken seriously myself, I add "that ain't the end of this horrid affair"; there were many others unknown to fame, "old Uncle Tom Cobbley and all"—and revert to grave discussion.

Clairvoyance is very frequent: it is sufficient to mention 1 Sam. ix, 16 *ff.* and 2 Kings vi, 17.[1]

In the New Testament the three outstanding examples are the Transfiguration, the Resurrection, and the spiritual manifestations at Corinth. The first proves that it is right to commune with the dead after the example of Jesus. The Resurrection falls into line with modern phenomena. Jesus, after a brief sojourn in Hades, returned to earth in His spiritual body. "Touch me not," addressed to Mary Magdalene, shows that the power at the first materialization was insufficient to allow physical contact. Exactly as happens to-day, the appearances, at first frequent, became rare and then ceased. That the disciples communed with the departed Jesus is acknowledged by all.

Public worship at Corinth must have been very like a séance. Of the spiritual gifts enumerated in 1 Cor. xii, miracles are strong psychic phenomena; discerning of spirits is clairvoyance; prophecy is prediction; speaking with tongues is clearly identified with modern examples.

Other points are the psychic body taught in 1 Cor. xv, 44 and 2 Cor. v, 1 *ff.*; St Paul's rapture into the third heaven (2 Cor. xii, 2); levitation (Mark vi, 48); clairvoyance (Matt. xvii, 27; John i, 48, xxi, 6); lights (Acts ii, 3); the direct voice (Luke ix, 35; John xii, 28; Acts ix, 7); white robes worn by the spirits (Luke xxiv, 4; Acts i, 10); and the vibration of a room (Acts iv, 31).

There is also the important text of Heb. xii. 22, 23: "Ye are come unto . . . the spirits of just men made perfect."

The Facts Stated

The best criterion of the above will be a brief, independent survey of the subject.

Psychic gifts were very common in the ancient world, and still are among primitive peoples; indeed, so far from their being, as has been thought, the dawn of a new faculty, they may be a survival of the original instinctive powers of humanity which the development of the rational faculties has put into the background. Primitive man[2] believed that spirits incarnated in men and animals were outposts of a vast spirit-world. St Paul (in 2 Cor. xii) is the only

[1] It is advisable to take all these passages at their face value in this debate and not to explain them away by critical methods. [2] The rest of this paragraph is based on Edwyn Bevan's *Sibyls and Seers.*

historical person said to have visited the other world, all others being legendary figures. Spirit-beings come to us; they are called up by a magician who has special knowledge, the purpose being to get information about what is going to happen in this world. They do not give descriptions of the other world; these come from men of this world who are said to have visited it. Among all the ghost stories of antiquity there is nothing resembling a modern séance with its corporate action by a group to enable spirit-beings to manifest themselves.[1]

The Old Testament attitude towards the next world is remarkable. Coming from Egypt, where the cult of the dead overshadowed all activities on earth, the Hebrews seem to have largely lost belief in a future existence and to have regained it in the best possible way—through belief in the living God, who was so real to them that they felt they could not be parted from Him by death. But popular Semitic ideas were deep-rooted, and so we find the two strains—the prophetic strain which abhorred necromancy and the continual tendency to revert to it. Isaiah's contempt for Spiritualism is seen in viii, 19: " When they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits and unto the wizards, that chirp and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? on behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead?" And in xxix. 4: " Thou shalt be brought down, and shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust; and thy voice shall be as of one that hath a familiar spirit. . . ."

The Law broke with the ancient world when it denounced all such things. See, especially, Deut. xviii, 10-12: " There shall not be found with thee . . . one that useth divination, one that practiseth augury, or an enchanter, or a sorcerer, or a charmer, or a consulter with a familiar spirit, or a wizard, or a necromancer." Manasseh is condemned: " He used enchantments, and dealt with them that had familiar spirits, and with wizards: he wrought much evil in the sight of the Lord " (2 Kings xxi, 6).

We must not, however, rationalize the Old Testament. The prophets were originally clairvoyants (" seers "), and were perhaps once valued chiefly as useful people to consult when one's asses strayed (1 Sam. ix). The glories of later

[1] This seems an over-statement in view of the witch of Endor; see below.

prophecy arose out of humble beginnings, and it never quite lost the mark of its early psychic and ecstatic stage.

The only detailed description of Spiritualism found in the Bible is the story of the witch of Endor (1 Sam. xxviii). She is "a woman that hath a familiar spirit", literally "mistress of an *'ōb*". The *'ōb* is what Spiritualists to-day call a "control", which is able to bring up Samuel. The manifestation takes place by night—that is, in the dark or with a dim light. The medium does not go into a trance. Samuel appears as he was best known to the sitters, as an old man. Apparently Saul sees nothing, because he has to ask the woman to describe the manifestation; but he hears a man's voice and is convinced of his approaching doom. It is emphasized that he goes against his conscience in consulting the medium.

Before we consider the New Testament two Bible words must be briefly examined—"angel" and "spirit"; it will have been noticed that appearances of these are claimed in support of Spiritualist theories. An angel, both in Hebrew and Greek, is simply a messenger, whether human or otherworldly. To the Hebrew, with his overpowering sense of divine reality, the emphasis lay, not on the instrument of the message, but on the sender; "angel" therefore is often too definite a word to be an adequate translation of the Hebrew *māl'āk*. "The angel of the Lord" is a manifestation of the Lord, a theophany, God appearing in His grace-dealings with Israel. Philo, who identified this angel with the Logos, was not far from the true meaning. The same usage prevails in the New Testament, where angels have no individuality; they are lost in their message.[1] The Old Testament conception is seen in the Acts: in xviii, 9 the Lord, in xxvii, 23 an angel of God, speaks to St Paul; St Luke clearly intends no difference of meaning. Christ is not an angel, certainly not a "higher spirit", but the Son. Compared with Him angels are disparaged, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews and by St Paul, for whom the Law was inferior to the new dispensation, *having been given through angels*, not by the Son (Gal. iii, 19; *cf.* i, 8). In Rom. viii, 38 (*cf.* Col. i, 16) angels, classed with principalities and powers, seem to be "elementals", not necessarily either good or bad.

[1] They have, however, a special function to perform at the Last Judgment.

Of spirit in the Græco-Roman world Prof. Dodd writes:[1] "In the refined materialism of popular Stoic philosophy in Paul's time the term was applied to an inconceivably tenuous form of matter, superior to the elements of earth, water, air, and fire. It was supposed to pervade the universe, as the breath pervades the body. . . . There is, however, little trace of this philosophical conception in Paul's thought, though some of his expressions may show something of its influence." Rather to him spirit is, as in the Old Testament, God's power breaking through—but now *in Christ*. For Gentile theology the spirits were very nearly identical with the angels of Jewish theology. Plutarch's treatment of spirit belongs to his physics, not to his metaphysics.[2]

Coming to the New Testament, we may confine ourselves to the same three points as before. In the Transfiguration story Moses and Elijah return and speak to Jesus of His approaching death. Jesus returns at the Resurrection and speaks to His disciples. These are the only examples in the whole Bible, excepting the story for which we are ultimately dependent on the witch of Endor, where a departed human being returns.[3] In the Corinthian Church ecstatic speaking was certainly common, but there is no suggestion of a medium's trance. St Paul disparages speaking with tongues in comparison with rational utterance: "I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (1 Cor. xiv, 19). Of particular importance is his conclusion: "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets" (1 Cor. xiv, 32); they are not "controlled".

On the other hand, sorcery generally was a foe to be overcome by the Apostolic Church: witness Simon Magus (Acts viii), Elymas (Acts xiii), and the possessors of magical books at Ephesus (Acts xix).

A Comparison

The New Testament evidence compels us to concede to Spiritualists the possibility of the dead returning and speaking to the living. Apart from this, the superficial re-

[1] *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, p. 117. [2] K. Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St Paul*, pp. 192-8; *The Beginnings of Christianity*, V. 103-4.
[3] Jairus' daughter, the widow's son, and Lazarus, are in a different category. They resume their ordinary life and are in no sense *revenants*.

semblances to modern Spiritualism found in the Bible are trivial in comparison with the immense differences That they exist at all is due to the fact that psychic gifts, such as clairvoyance, and an ear attuned to messages from the other world, which necessarily came in symbolic form, were so widely prevalent among the men and women of the Bible. But nothing resembling a medium is found, except at Endor. In the Resurrection stories, if the Spiritualist theory holds, we must suppose that the disciples generally were mediums—which is highly improbable, since the gift is supposed to be rare. In the Acts there is no return of dead men, and no attempt is made to seek guidance from the departed. At the very supper of the Lord the faithful are content with a spiritual (in the true sense) presence, and for anything more are content to wait " until he come ". Instead of trying to get further guidance from the exalted Jesus, they jealously treasure the words spoken by Him during His ministry. As to what words he heard in the third heaven, St Paul can only say, " It is not lawful for a man to utter " them.

We may add that Father Abraham gives no encouragement to the idea of Dives that any good purpose would be served by the return of Lazarus to earth; and the souls of the martyrs in Rev. vi, who are stirred by the thought of the persecution continuing on earth, are told to " rest yet for a little time ". W. K. Lowther Clarke.

(*To be concluded.*)

The Lachish Excavations and their Bearing upon Old Testament Study

Lachish is first known to history from the Tell-el-Amarna letters, whence we learn that in the fifteenth century B.C. the city was united with Gezer and Askalon in hostility to its Egyptian overlord, and that it was in consequence a constant source of worry to the loyal Abdi-Hiba, governor of Jerusalem.[1] The first mention of Lachish in the Old Testament is at the time of the conquest, when it appears as an Amorite stronghold joined with Jerusalem, Hebron,

[1] Tell-el-Amarna Letters (ed. Knudtzon), cclxxxvii, 15, cclxxxviii, 43, cccxxviii, 5, cccxxix, 6, cccxxxv, 10, 16.

Jarmuth, and Eglon in a league of defence against the Hebrew invader.[1] After its reduction by Joshua[2] it was numbered, according to the priestly writer, among the "lowland" cities of Judah;[3] and as such it was "built for defence" (*i.e.*, fortified) in the tenth century by Rehoboam, the first ruler of the now separate southern kingdom.[4] Some hundred and fifty years later it was the scene of the murder by conspirators of Amaziah, the Judæan king who had conquered Edom.[5]

In 701 Lachish was captured by Sennacherib and made the base of his operations in the district.[6] A series of sculptures from Sennacherib's own palace at Kuyunjik, and now in the British Museum, graphically records this phase of the city's history. The Assyrian assault upon the walls, their defence, the breach, and the ensuing executions are all depicted in turn; and Sennacherib himself is shown seated on his throne outside the city while representatives of the conquered inhabitants either stand or kneel before him. Four lines of cuneiform text read:

> Sennacherib, king of the world, king of Assyria, sat upon his throne and the spoil of Lachish passed before him.

Subsequently the city was rebuilt and, it seems, refortified, since during Nebuchadnezzar's second investment of Jerusalem more than a century after the campaign of Sennacherib, Lachish and Azekah are mentioned together by Jeremiah as the only remaining "fortified cities" which were left to Judah.[7] Neither, however, would appear to have escaped the general ruin which culminated in the fall of the capital. After the Captivity Lachish figures for the last time in the Old Testament among the list of sites reoccupied by the returned exiles.[8]

This thumb-nail sketch is tantalizingly meagre. For although ten years ago we knew far more about Lachish than we did about many of the other Canaanite-Israelite cities, the available facts were quite inadequate for the construction of anything like a continuous historical record. Accordingly, a more than ordinary interest was aroused

---

[1] Josh. x, 3 *ff.* [2] Josh. x, 31, 32, xii, 11. [3] Josh. xv, 39.
[4] 2 Chron. xi, 9. [5] 2 Kings xiv, 19=2 Chron. xxv, 27.
[6] 2 Kings xviii, 13, 14, *cf.* 2 Chron. xxxii, 9; 2 Kings xviii, 17=Is. xxxvi, 2; 2 Kings xix, 8=Is. xxxvii, 8. [7] Jer. xxxiv, 7.
[8] Neh. xi, 30.

when the suggestion was made in 1933, and later confirmed,[1] that the mound of Tell-ed-Duweir, some thirty miles south-west of Jerusalem, was to be identified as Lachish.[2] Excavation had been started in the previous winter by a joint British and American expedition under the leadership of Mr J. L. Starkey; and, although during the five subsequent seasons the work was financed entirely by the British Wellcome-Marston Archæological Research Expedition to the Near East, Mr Starkey remained in charge throughout until his death at the hands of Arab brigands on January 10, 1938. Mr C. H. Inge then assumed control and presented the report for the season 1937-8; but in view of the disturbed political condition of the country the expedition decided, at any rate temporarily, to suspend operations. The outbreak of war in 1939 has naturally rendered any resumption impossible.[3]

The results obtained can hardly be described as revolutionary; yet they both add to our knowledge of the history, life, and culture of the Ancient East, and in addition furnish a valuable commentary on the Old Testament record. In what follows I shall first outline the history of Lachish as it may be reconstructed from the excavations, noting not only finds which are of importance in themselves, but also points of special interest for Biblical study; and I shall then pass on to a consideration of the bearing of the discoveries upon our understanding of the Old Testament as a whole and our estimate of its " truth ".

The history of Lachish begins towards the end of the third millennium B.C., when the mound was inhabited by cave-dwellers. Stone door-sills and jambs with stone pivot-sockets point to the use of wooden doors to the caves, while the domestic debris witnesses to a fair standard of civilization having been attained, in particular to an ability to work efficiently in copper. Subsequently the city was fortified by a *glacis*, or sloping wall with a ditch at the bottom, the

[1] Note, however, the caution of Professor Thomas in *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, October, 1940, pp. 148 *f.* [2] The previous identification of Tell-el-Hesy (excavated by Petrie and Bliss in 1891-2) with Lachish was, of course, only tentative, and, almost certainly, inaccurate. Tell-el-Hesy is in all probability the ancient Eglon. [3] In addition to the annual reports in the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* the Expedition has so far published *Lachish I: The Lachish Letters* (O.U.P., 1938) and *Lachish II: The Fosse Temple* (O.U.P., 1940).

characteristic defence of the Semitic "Hyksos" kings of Egypt. And from now onwards Egyptian contacts are most marked. A number of scarabs bearing Hyksos royal names have come to light, among them two of Apepi, whom tradition[1] names as "Joseph's Pharaoh", and one of Aa-hetep-Ra of the XVIth dynasty, whose existence is only attested by the five other scarabs previously discovered. A bronze dagger of not later than 1600 B.C. is inscribed with four pictographic signs, apparently related on the one hand to the Sinaitic inscriptions and on the other to the Cretan. Since the dagger is clearly a native production its evidence is of value to the historian of the alphabet in his investigations into the earlier stages of the proto-Phœnician script.

With the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt in 1580 and the rise of the powerful XVIIIth dynasty, Lachish entered upon the most prosperous period of its history. For four hundred years it remained part of the Egyptian empire, and in no less than three different directions the ever-increasing population overflowed to form suburbs outside the walls. Egyptian influence is everywhere evident. From a XIXth dynasty tomb comes a coffin with a hieroglyphic inscription (the only one so far found in Palestine) and portraits of Isis and Nephthys on the sides; in the south-east suburb was found a bronze "Maat" feather overlaid with gold-leaf dating from about 1300 B.C.; while in a rectangular building, probably a government store, was discovered a small bowl inscribed in hieratic of the thirteenth or twelfth century. From this last it appears that the officials at Lachish were using both the Egyptian calendar and the Egyptian system of numeration.

The most interesting building of this period, however, is a small temple outside the walls, which seems to have been erected first about 1500, and although twice afterwards rebuilt continued in constant use until it was destroyed by fire at the beginning of the twelfth century. Of the identity of the deity, or deities, here worshipped, we are unaware;[2] but the general layout is similar to that of the Beisan temples. A number of ritual vessels lay scattered at the base of the altar; the altar itself had three steps leading up to it;[3] and

[1] Georgius Syncellus (ed. Goar), pp. 62, 69, 107. [2] It is suggested that since the temple is built outside the walls it will have been used for some extraneous cult. [3] Compare the prohibition of steps to an Israelite altar in Ex. xx, 26.

along the walls were a series of benches, presumably for the reception of offerings.

It was in the rubbish-pit of this temple that the so-called "Lachish ewer" was found. The inscription round the top (in an early alphabetic script) has been variously deciphered; but all authorities are agreed that the first word of the three is to be read MTN (=gift). Also, in a grave, which from the pottery it contains must be assigned to roughly the same date as the destruction of the temple, was discovered a bowl with twelve alphabetic characters painted on in white. No generally accepted interpretation has yet been put forward. Yet the ewer and the bowl together witness indubitably to the use of an alphabet in Palestine about the year 1200.

The exact circumstance which precipitated the temple's downfall we shall probably never know. Yet the fact that other buildings were also burned at the same time points to a general calamity having overtaken the city, marking the end of Egyptian control. It is naturally tempting to connect this calamity with the sack of the city by Joshua at the time of the Hebrew invasion.[1] But at all events the next discovery worthy of notice is a rock-hewn tomb of the time of Solomon, which from its contents is thought to have been that of a priest. The human remains were placed to one side upon a bench cut out of the rock, and among the surrounding objects was a bone plaque pierced with thirty holes—perhaps a calendar for marking the days of the month to aid the owner in his official ritual observances. On the floor lay a three-pronged iron fork, which is the only example so far brought to light of the "fleshhook of three teeth" mentioned as employed at a sacrifice by the priest's servant in 1 Sam. ii, 13.

From the days of Solomon we pass to those of Hezekiah. Presumably it was the very fortifications that Rehoboam had built[2] which Sennacherib breached in his assault of 701. And there is ample evidence from Lachish itself to confirm the truth of Sennacherib's story. An ossuary containing the bones of at least fifteen hundred human beings, some partially calcined, is in all probability to be connected with the reconstruction of the city after the departure of

[1] Such a connexion will of course carry with it the acceptance of the "late" date for the Exodus (*c.* 1220) as against the "early" date (*c.* 1440) now generally favoured.

[2] 2 Chron. xi, 9.

the Assyrian army; while the bronze crest of a helmet, discovered against the face of the middle wall, corresponds exactly with the type worn by Sennacherib's soldiery as depicted upon the bas-reliefs in the British Museum. Of the same date, too, is a seal reading, "belonging to Shebna", in the ordinary Phœnician script.[1] A Shebna is mentioned several times in the Old Testament[2] as an important official of Hezekiah, and, since we know from 2 Kings xviii, 14 that Hezekiah sent an embassy to Sennacherib at Lachish, it is possible that Shebna accompanied the embassy and left in the seal a memorial of his visit.

The tombs of the seventh and early sixth centuries provide an interesting commentary upon the popular religion, containing as they do many amulets of Egyptian deities and pottery figurines of the Mesopotamian Ishtar. One seal, which in the lower register reads "belonging to Shefatyahu", has in the upper register a figure of a winged serpent and the Egyptian "ankh", or life sign. This only shows how a man, who was sufficiently orthodox to have the Hebrew Divine Name as a component part of his own name, was nevertheless also deeply affected by non-Hebrew influences. We are reminded of Jeremiah's continued denunciation of the apostasy of his people[3] and his specific reference to the making of "cakes for the Queen of Heaven", and the pouring out of "drink-offerings unto other gods",[4] in the last days of the Judæan kingdom.

In both 597 and 588 Lachish suffered severely from the Babylonian onslaught. The evidence proves that before 597 the city was packed with houses and also strongly fortified; but Nebuchadnezzar's army literally burned its way in by firing the walls and reducing the limestone to powder. A road of this date has been exposed, with remains of burnt houses on either side, in one of which was found a bin still full of olive stones. The palace fort also appears to have been destroyed in the first attack and not subsequently rebuilt. From its ruins a row of poor houses was constructed in the Zedekiah period typical of the city's

[1] *I.e.*, the common alphabetic script already well known from the Moabite Stone, the Siloam Tunnel Inscription, and several Phœnician inscriptions. This script was the parent of both the modern "square" Hebrew and the Greek alphabets, and in it the greater part of the Old Testament itself must have been originally written. [2] 2 Kings xviii, 18, 26, 37, xix, 2 = Is. xxxvi, 3, 11, 22, xxxvii, 2; Is. xxii, 15. [3] *E.g.*, Jer. iii, 6 *ff.* [4] Jer. vii, 18.

reduced prosperity. It was now but thinly populated and protected by makeshift defences. Moreover, the end was near.

To the state of affairs before Nebuchadnezzar's final attack the now famous "Lachish Letters" bear eloquent testimony. Discovered in 1935[1] amid the ruins of a small room under the gate tower, these twenty-one ink-inscribed potsherds constitute the most important find in the whole history of Palestinian archæology. Not only are they the only Hebrew documents, apart from the Old Testament itself, which have been preserved,[2] but they are also especially valuable in that, whereas the Old Testament text has been edited and re-edited, they can still be read exactly as they were written, and so provide contemporary evidence for the script, language, ideas, and history of the period to which they belong.

They are mostly incoming letters to "my Lord Ya'ush", who seems to have been the military governor of Lachish. The first letter is no more than a list of names, but it is interesting for comparison with the biblical names;[3] here the divine element is almost always spelt *-yahu*, whilst the Bible vacillates between *-yahu* and *-yah*, with a preference for the latter. Another letter which speaks of "the commander of the army, Yikhbaryahu, the son of Elnathan," going down to Egypt to bring back a fugitive, is strangely reminiscent of the story of Urijah, who, having prophesied against Jehoiakim, fled to Egypt, but was brought back to Jerusalem by "Elnathan, son of Achbor," and there put to death.[4] Again, Letter IV explicitly mentions Lachish: "For we are watching for the signals of Lachish," the writer assures Ya'ush, "according to all the signs which my lord gives, for we do not see (the signals of) Azekah." Presumably Azekah had already fallen and the letter is to be dated soon after the time "when the King of Babylon's army fought against Jerusalem and against all the cities of Judah that were left, against Lachish and Azekah; for these alone remained of the cities of Judah as fenced cities".[5]

After the second deportation in 586 Nebuchadnezzar appointed Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam, as governor in place of Zedekiah.[6] And although it cannot be dated exactly, a clay seal impression "belonging to Gedaliah, who

[1] Eighteen were discovered in 1935 and three in 1938. [2] The Siloam Inscription can hardly be cited as a parallel. [3] *N.B.*—Jaazaniah, Jeremiah, Mattaniah, and Neriah. [4] Jer. xxvi, 20-23. Jer. xxxiv, 7. [6] 2 Kings xxv, 22.

is over the House", may refer to this Gedaliah, especially as the title "who is over the House" would seem from the Old Testament to indicate a high state official.[1] If so, its survival is a melancholy reminder both of the unfortunate man himself and of the years of desolation which his governorship inaugurated.

In the Persian period Lachish was rebuilt and entered upon the last phase in its history. The gateways were made narrower and shoddily erected on the pre-exilic foundations. A residence for the Persian governor arose on the site of the former palace-fort with private apartments and municipal offices ranged round a central courtyard. A large private house of the same period and general lay-out has also been excavated. And in the north-east area of the city a special shrine would appear to have been dedicated to the cult of the sun. But with the coming of Alexander and the passing of Palestine under the Ptolemaic rule the city was finally abandoned, gradually to become the mound of ruins that it is to-day.

Lachish thus appears as a typical Canaanite-Israelite city, though it has probably yielded proportionately more of its secrets than any other single Palestinian site. Geographically situated in a key position amid the western foothills of the Judæan range, half-way between Gaza and Jerusalem, and on the main Gaza-Hebron road, it was necessarily a meeting-place of trade and culture. Yet not for this reason is it any the less typical.

For many years it has been pointed out that the early excavations reveal that it is impossible to draw any sharp line of distinction between Hebrew and non-Hebrew occupation of a site, and that the architecture, household effects, and religious relics unearthed in Palestine exhibit a steady development, in which no specifically Hebrew influence, as distinct from general Canaanite, can be detected. Lachish provides but another illustration of the truth of this contention. At no point in the city's history is it possible from the archæological data alone to isolate a period and label it decisively either "Israelite" or "Jewish"; nor can we speak of distinctively Hebrew scripts, pottery, or cult objects. The invaders under Joshua would seem to have adopted almost unaltered the culture, ideas, and mode of

[1] *E.g.*, 1 Kings iv, 6, xvi, 9, 2 Kings xv, 5, xix, 2, Is. xxxvi, 3.

life of the Canaanites among whom they settled. The tombs of every period are rich in amulets and scarabs of Egyptian origin. And even in the late Judæan kingdom amulets representing Egyptian deities (most probably imported from the Nile valley) are frequently met with in Hebrew burials, together with pottery Astarte figures and pottery models of couches and chairs such as are common in Mesopotamia.

All this is a speaking commentary upon the Old Testament record. So far from being a dedicated race and " a peculiar people unto the Lord their God ",[1] the Israelites " drave not out the inhabitants of the land " but " let them remain as thorns in their sides, and their gods a snare ";[2] in other words, they mingled freely with the Canaanites and conformed to the diffused Near Eastern civilization and cult pattern of the day. The whole idea of the Call of Israel and the consciousness of its Divine Mission were not indigenous; they were the great contribution of the writing prophets.

And in conclusion, to what extent do the Lachish excavations either confirm or disprove the " truth " of the Bible ?

In the earlier days of the critical movement the wildest hypotheses were advanced in the name of criticism, and a very great deal of the Old Testament history was dismissed as myth or legend. But archæology has taught us wisdom. From Egypt, from Mesopotamia, from Syria, and from Palestine itself, has come a mass of material which can be set alongside the Old Testament and compared. In the nature of the case the testimony of the major part of this material is unassailable, since it consists of evidence contemporary with the persons and events whose historicity is under discussion. Speaking generally, the trend of the archæological evidence has been to deny the wilder of the critics' theories and to substantiate the truth of the Old Testament's statements. And to this ever-increasing mass of evidence Lachish has now added its quota. Nothing has there been found which in any way contradicts the Biblical record; but, as we have seen, there is much which confirms it, illustrates it, and fills it out—notably the unambiguous remains of Nebuchadnezzar's two assaults.

[1] Exod. xix, 5, Deut. vii, 6, xiv, 2, xxvi, 18. [2] Num. xxxiii, 55; Judg. ii, 3.

Yet we must beware of pressing the argument too far. There are certain writers who, approaching the subject from a dogmatic angle, are concerned, not so much to *inquire* whether the events of Bible history be fact or otherwise, as to *prove* " the Bible true ", because on *a priori* theological grounds they believe it to be the perfect and inerrant Word of God. It is well, therefore, to be reminded now and then that archæology is a double-edged weapon, and that it by no means always gives its verdict for the Bible. For example, the wellnigh universal abandonment to-day of belief in the historicity and exilic date of the Book of Daniel is due, primarily, not to the perversity of critics, nor yet to the scepticism of " modern thought ", but to the cumulative effect of the archæological discoveries of the last hundred years, which by any candid student will be recognized as telling as decisively against Daniel as they do in favour of Jeremiah.

Furthermore, such writers habitually fail to distinguish not only the work of one critic from another, but also the conclusions which the critic has reached as a critic from those he puts forward as an historian on grounds of general probability. A vague and undefined " criticism " is thus contrasted with " the facts brought to light by archæology ", and the conclusion drawn that " archæology has disproved criticism ". The Lachish ewer provides an excellent illustration of the fallacy of this procedure. It has recently been argued that since the ewer proves conclusively that an alphabetic script was known in Palestine in the age of Moses, there is now no objection to our supposing that the Pentateuch was indeed Moses' work, and that in consequence the critical theory of Pentateuchal origins is no longer tenable. In this way the critical position is made to depend upon an assumption that Moses could not write ! But no reputable modern critic has ever been guilty of such an assumption.[1] In point of fact, the documentary analysis of the Pentateuch rests upon a number of complicated and

[1] *E.g.*, nearly twenty years before the discovery of the Lachish ewer so eminent a critic as the late Dr Burney argued on grounds of general probability for the diffusion of an alphabetic script in Canaan at the time of the Judges, and perhaps as early as the fourteenth century B.C. (" The Use of Writing among the Israelites at the Time of the Judges," in *The Book of Judges*, pp. 253 *ff.*). The discoveries at Lachish have now confirmed the truth of his argument, without in any way disturbing his critical conclusions.

detailed literary arguments, which, in so far as they are based upon differences of style within the individual books, could not be affected even by the discovery of an indisputably authentic production of Moses himself, much less by the existence of a few alphabetic letters of questionable interpretation round the rim of a broken pot.

We need here, as elsewhere, a sense of proportion. And the truth is that criticism and archæology are not opposite but complementary modes of approach. The one deals with the evidence from within the Old Testament, the other with that from without. But both are equally necessary. It is but natural that the trend of scholarship, or it may be a chance discovery, should fix popular attention now upon one, and now upon the other. Yet the wise student will not be misled by the excitement of the moment. He knows well enough that just as the theories of the critic need checking, and perhaps revising, in the light of the evidence of the archæologist, so, also, the archæological discoveries themselves can only rightly be interpreted by means of the critical conclusions. In a word, he knows that he can only hope to reach the truth as he is both critic and archæologist in one.

H. F. D. Sparks.

Coventry Patmore's Theology of the Incarnation

In his interpretation of the Incarnation, Coventry Patmore wrote in a way attuned with, though also he went beyond, the position taken up by J. A. Möhler (1796-1838). It was Möhler who gave the cue to Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce to see in the Christian sacraments a continuation of the Incarnation of the Divine Word in the life of the Church of Christ. And the writers of *Lux Mundi* helped to make this the doctrine of all of the more liberal of Anglican High Churchmen. Patmore's *The Rod, the Root, and the Flower* (1896) appealed a good deal to the Anglican point of view in a kind of Newmanian fashion; however, he really was very deeply absorbed in the Roman Catholic way of faith. On this latter point, I think that, among his biographers, Mr Shane Leslie has given the best possible appreciation of Patmore's standing with his fellow

religionists. On that theme I refer readers to Mr Leslie's *Splendid Failures.*

Patmore anticipated, and also went far beyond, the modern conception of the soul as what is called " the psyche "—that is, as an astonishingly balanced yet unique totality of mind and sense " life ". It was in approaching " soul " observationally that he found it possible to treat the soul as itself a " personality ", hence as " the Lady Psyche " of an allusion like:

What if this Lady be thy Soul ?

In this way in *Psyche Odes* he brought the pragmatic modern conception of our *psyche* into a reasonable harmony with the " Psyche " of the Apuleian legend and of Keats's " goddess " in his *Ode to Psyche.* With this his own pragmatic or experimental view of " soul " as preamble, it will be possible to appreciate Patmore's doctrine about the Incarnation of the Divine Word through the Church, as in a way to be " carried on " and " fulfilled " in every single soul, or rather body-soul, among mankind.

As to how Patmore grasped the faith of the Incarnation, I will first quote this sentence of his:

> The religion of most people who are sincerely religious is in a state of fire-mist, which a due meditation on the Incarnation would condense into New Heavens and a New Earth (p. 20).[1]

The next saying I quote brings us a step further towards the really central view of Patmore:

> Belief in the Incarnation is immortality, for it really subsists only with those in whom the Incarnation already is. " None can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost " (p. 28).

The following is the most positive of all his allusions to the Incarnation, as it is fulfilled in every true man:

> There is one secret the greatest of all—a secret which no previous religion dared, even in enigma, to allege fully—which is stated with the utmost distinction by our Lord and the Church. . . .
>
> I mean the doctrine of the Incarnation, regarded not merely as an historic event which occurred two thousand years ago, but (also) as an event which is renewed in the body of everyone who is in the way to the fulfilment of his original destiny (p. 122).

[1] All quotations are from *The Rod, the Root, and the Flower.*

Already, here, in his allusion to " the Church ", Patmore is seen to take his place with those little-appreciated " sacramental mystics ". Nearly all writers except, maybe, here and there, a von Hügel or a Miss Underhill speak of all mysticism, with its sense of the immanence of God in man, as one and the same, always and everywhere. But the few referred to allow that *sacramental* or incarnational mysticism is not only not the same as that of the more typical Taulers and Boehmes, but rather that, in some of its features, it is even the very reverse. To Patmore, for instance, these mystics of the standard type were to be looked up to, yet they aspired mainly to be absorbed in the Infinite. Like Madame de Guyon they tended ever to become, though not necessarily in unorthodox fashion, Quietists. But, to Patmore, the very idea of the Incarnation was a revelation that the true God was the perfect reverse of anything " merely infinite ", of any mere " Pacific Ocean of Reality ".

God, rather, loved to become more and more perfectly " confined ". His joy thus in becoming incarnate was of His own " eternal style ".

If we must think of the Infinite, the most profitable way is to think of God as having made Himself infinitely small, a mere babe . . . to suit Himself to the smallness of our capacity.

> For ah ! who can express
> How full of bonds and simpleness
> Is God;
> How narrow is He
> And how the wide waste field of possibility
> Is only trod
> Straight to His homestead in the human heart—
> . . . Who woos man's will
> To wedlock with His own, and does distil
> To that drop's span
> The attar of all rose-fields of all love (p. 103).

We can now, perhaps, see the rationale of Patmore's doctrine of Sacrament as of the act of God, the Ultimate Reality, fulfilling His own characteristic incarnation desire continuously more and more in the lives of men.

After quoting the words, " The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life," Patmore comments:

It is not the Spirit, but the Body of God, God received by and beautifying the senses and the affections, by which we are saved.

The Spirit of God comes and goes, may be given and for ever withdrawn; but the Body and the Blood are the " sure mercies of David ", after having once tasted which the soul cries: " How lovely are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts ! My heart and my flesh have rejoiced in the living God " (p. 126).

Though I do not think he formally said so, Patmore takes the particular sacraments to be but phases of that Sacrament of Sacraments, the union itself of Christ with His Church. This comes out especially when, in agreement with mystical theology, he distinguishes between the Real Sacramental Presence and the Manifest Presence:

To some there is revealed a Sacrament greater than that of the Real Presence, a Sacrament of the Manifest Presence, which is (the sum, and is) more than the sum, of all the Sacraments (p. 13).

Patmore explained what he meant by the Sacrament of the Manifest Presence in words such as these:[1]

To some, not necessarily, perhaps, the greatest of the Saints, Christ is actually and perceptibly risen. He has turned the water of nature into the wine of the Marriage Feast, though His time is not yet come. And to the Sacrament of the Real Presence He has added a Sacrament of the Manifest Presence.

For souls thus favoured the Church's teaching and rites are but as a scaffolding which has fulfilled its purpose. The Temple is built and occupied " Felix quem Veritas per se docet. . . . Taceant omnes doctores " (p. 55).

The Manifestation which Patmore accepted from a number of scriptural sayings about God—about God manifested in Christ, and in the mystery of Christ's identity with His Church (or *sacramentum* as the Vulgate has it)—is also, as we here see, translated into the experience of man.

[1] As Patmore was accused of illiberalism, we should note these sayings of his which bear witness to his greater inclusiveness: " What discredits the idea of Revelation most with those who doubt is the denial that it is communicated to the whole world. Whereas it is expressly affirmed in the very first words of St John's Gospel, that this ' Light lighteth every one that cometh into the world ', only they have loved darkness better than light. A Witness to a revelation is a different thing; and that religion has the best claims upon us which professes, as Christianity does, to be mainly a Witness to that original and universal light " (p. 72). And again: " When first you unite yourself by charity to the whole human race, then shall you indeed perceive that Christ died for you " (p. 76).

The mystics adopted the Pauline " Birth of Christ in us " and our participation in Christ's life and divinity, our dying and rising again, our living the risen life, into a full program of the life ascetical and spiritual and mystical here upon earth. But Patmore, accepting the data of the mystics, went back to what, in essence, was a more evangelical idea. At least, if he was mystical, he was so in a Johannine, not in a Dionysius the Areopagite, sense.

He finds his inspiration here in the key-passage, which itself, of course, is from St Paul, " the manifestation of the sons of God, to wit, the redemption of our bodies." The phrase " redemption of the body " provides support to Patmore's thoughts about our " redeemed senses ", about a really experienced " risen life ". As he saw it, this is an experience of " the redemption and transfiguration of the senses by participation in Christ's spiritual body ".

> And some, as we may clearly infer from Christ's promises and the witness of the saintly, do attain to this resurrection with Christ, this manifestation even now . . . " they so behold His presence in righteousness . . . they thus wake up after His likeness and are satisfied with it " in this world (p. 133).

But Patmore is really at his best when, accepting these doctrines about the " new seeing ", the " new hearing ", " feeling ", and " tasting ", he interprets them himself as an observing psychologist. It was natural, in his own approach to the Kingdom, that, as author of *The Angel in the House*, and as psychologist of the domestic affections, he should here have found his chief parable of the Kingdom within his own province.

In an essay, " The Precursor ", in his *Religio Poetæ*, for instance, he interprets his favourite theme that secular love, as interpreted by artist, novelist, poet, or psychologist, is as a John the Baptist who prepares the way of the " true Messiah "—namely, for the coming of the Love Divine, the love of God for man and of man for God.

The redeemed and risen life, on account of the higher felicity which it imparted, was to him as a sharing in the true " paradise regained ". In the sentence given below there are references to the pleasures of the redeemed senses. In the latter half, especially, Patmore introduces his favourite theme of the Dawn of Love on Youth and Maiden, on which his " Dean Churchill " preached at the wedding of his *Felix* and *Honoria* in Salisbury Cathedral. Patmore

gives his own view of how this " first love " is precursor to that which is, in heaven, the last.

The glorified body which some—for instance, St Teresa—have seen in this life is the ten-stringed harp of David, each of its members constituting a distinct note, corresponding to one of the ten spheres; and its tones and considerations are

Sweet as stops
Of planetary music heard in trance.

In the brief, virginal, vision of natural love this fact is sufficiently apparent to take away all excuse for irreverent regard for the Soul's blissful and immortal companion, the Body, and to supply the most sensible motive for whatever self-denial may be necessary to the attainment of that vision in perpetuity (p. 152).

I think, however, that Patmore did recognize the point of his own quite original contribution to the application, let us say, of Johannine incarnation theology. In the following paragraph he distinguishes between renunciants who yet enjoy redeemed felicities and those who, like the author of *The Dark Night of the Soul*, renounce even this " temporal paradise ".

He who renounces goods, house, wife, and the rest for God's sake, shall receive a hundredfold in this life with life everlasting. But he who, having obtained this hundredfold return of all his natural delights transfigured, renounces this also, and acknowledges no consolation but his share in the agony of the Cross, shall shine for ever in heaven as a sun among the stars. Yet even he cannot escape his temporal reward, but hyssop itself, in touching his lips, becomes honey.

Thus irresistibly by Gods embraced
Is she who boasts her more than mortal chaste (p. 154).

And I think that Patmore is right, according to the Gospel with its Transfiguration narrative which records that momentary forestalling of the glory to be revealed, in what he says here:

There was a truly divine epicureanism hidden in the reply of the Greek philosopher to someone who wondered how it was that he seemed to despise the delight of love, " I have tasted that sweetness once." He that would be worthy of the Beatific Vision must fix his thoughts, not on the beatitude, but on the Vision. " The Vision," cries St Thomas Aquinas, " is a virtue, the beatitude an accident "; and the psalmist says, " So let me behold Thy presence in *righteousness*, that I may wake up after Thy likeness, and be satisfied with it " (p. 158).

Yet, for all that the Gospel itself offered by way of its " paradise of temporal delights ", Patmore faced also the chief further problems about this present dispensation: about the world-story, the gathering of the nations to judgment day, and hell and heaven also. As to the world and its fate, he was no easy Broad Church Immanentist. In fact, as his biographers tell us, he had been early influenced by reading that aristocratic pessimist Schopenhauer. " Nations die of softening of the brain, which for a long time passes for softening of the heart," was one of his sayings. Yet, certainly, this and all Patmore's political pessimism must be read in the light of his supreme Hebraic faith in a New Divine Manifestation to the multitudes.

And, as to this, I think that Shane Leslie realizes how Patmore was confessedly a failure, at least on this one point. He had written once that " best seller ", his *Angel in the House*, on domestic love; he wrote also what someone called that " worst seller ", *The Unknown Eros*, his odes on the divine love.

Yet no one knew better than Patmore that the Gospel itself was a " best seller " after its way, and that Christ Himself, as is shown in His parables, was a master comprehender of the multitudes' mind. Patmore cherished beliefs which to him were the very Gospel, if in a new manifestation. They were in potency a joy to all peoples. Yet, as he confesses in *The Open Secret*, he completely failed to get his message across to any but to a very select, chosen few. In thirty years he kept on seeking to translate, but he could not do so.

While any cultured scholar may easily appreciate the reason why he could not bring off his latter-day " best seller " on the Divine Love, the fact that he aimed at doing so in the service of the millions helps us to set limits upon his own seeming aloofness and his occasional utterance of anti-popular views. He appealed in fact certainly only to some select souls.

Yet in doing so he thought of every new initiate to his circle as a possible instrument who might hasten the day for the publication of that good news of a newly translated gospel " to you and all mankind ".

Every soul was created to be, if she chose, a participator in this felicity, that is of " the glory which the Son had with the Father before the beginning of the world." This is the sum

total of " mysticism " or true science, and he who has not attained, through denial of himself, to some sensible knowledge of this felicity, in reality knows nothing (p. 65).

Patmore believed that the soul was of a likeness to God, and the body an image and likeness to the soul. And, as to the sometimes visible beauty of the soul, he tells of a saint who prayed to see rather her sins than God's graces towards her. She feared, that is, as to seeing her own grace-bedecked loveliness (p. 132).

As to the final state of beatitude, Patmore wrote in a way that brought to completion his own conception of man as in the Pauline and Thomistic sense a corporate personality, the *persona una* of St Thomas:

> Theologians teach that our ultimate felicity will consist in the development of a single divine humanity made up of innumerable unique and sympathetic individualities or members, each one shining with its proper and peculiar lustre as that of a sapphire is from that of a ruby or an emerald.
>
> Theologians further teach that the end of this life is the awakening and growth of such individualities through a faithful following of the peculiar good which is in each individual's ruling love; since each has his ruling love, if he knew it, that is his peculiar and partial way of discerning and desiring the absolute good (p. 194).

Patmore accepted from St Thomas that conception of eternal life which later inspired von Hügel:

> " Eternity," says Aquinas, " is the entire simultaneous and perfect possession of a life without end." God goes forth from simplicity into all particulars of reality. Man returns in his peculiar and partial apprehension of reality to God, and his eternity is " the entire simultaneous and perfect possession of a life " which is the synthesis of all the real apprehensions, or perceptions of good, which he has acquired here (p. 64).

Resurrection, to the prophets, was given as Jehovah's own world-glorification rather than merely man's. God who gave this Process World must be glorified some day before the earth; or, in effect, to all this creation there is no real God. And that truth Patmore had grasped very much better than the all-too-easy modern champions of an evasive Platonic " spiritual immortality " against the Christian creed's " I believe in the resurrection of the dead ".

To regard God without particular apprehensions of the imagination and merely as a Spirit endowed with certain "attributes", "C'est anéantir le Christianisme sous pretexte de le purifier", says Fénelon.

On the contrary, the contemplation of the mysteries of the Incarnation in the analogies of our own nature is declared by theologians and saints to be the perfection of wisdom (p. 125).

RICHARD DE BARY.

The Future of Sunday

PARLIAMENT has rejected the proposal to open theatres on Sundays, a fresh evidence of the strength of the Protestant tradition in this country. For the time being the theatres will remain closed, but few will doubt that another attempt will be made to open them, and few will attach much importance to the plea that it is only intended as a war-time measure. We are all aware that the general attitude to Sunday has changed profoundly, that many inroads have been made, and that there is no reason why they should cease at this particular point.

The clash and the respite give us an opportunity, if we are willing to take it, to do some thinking about this institution, to make up our minds what kind of future we wish for it and think possible for it. Our treatment of Sunday during the last fifty years or so has been marked by characteristic failure to think out principles. The law has been relaxed piecemeal and without consistency, public opinion has been uncertain and muddle-headed, the ecclesiastical authorities have given us no clear lead. There is everything to be gained by examining the history of Sunday, and the functions and sanctions which have been attributed to it at various times.

The Christian Sunday certainly dates back to apostolic days. The early Christians used to assemble on the first day of the week for breaking of bread, for instruction and exhortation, and probably for the collection of alms. The day was chosen to commemorate the Resurrection, and it early became known as the Lord's Day. There is nothing to suggest that it was identified with the Jewish Sabbath, or that the duties attaching to the Sabbath were transferred to it. Attendance at these meetings was certainly regarded

as one of the marks of a loyal and fervent Christian. Total abstinence from work was probably impossible in the early days, when a large number of converts were slaves; but as early as Tertullian's time the desirability of it was felt. When Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire, edicts were passed prohibiting work and the transaction of business.

Certainly the main tradition of the Church down to the period of the Reformation was that Sunday was a festival. St Augustine declared that to fast on Sundays was a sin. And whilst it is true that the Emperor Theodosius in A.D. 386 forbade games and spectacles, this was probably on account of their moral disrepute rather than a condemnation of recreation in general. But it is also true that there was a growing tendency to identify the Christian Sunday with the Jewish Sabbath. It is one of the ironies of history that Protestantism should have become identified with a stricter sabbatarianism than that of the Roman Catholic Church, since the main Protestant tendency was to deprecate distinctions of days and seasons; such was certainly the attitude of the Lollards and of the Waldenses. Most of the leading reformers rejected the theory of Sunday which identified it with the Jewish Sabbath, but they justified its observance on grounds of tradition and of utility. The turning of the Protestants in Great Britain to an extreme and rigid sabbatarianism has little parallel on the Continent, and it seems to have been due in large measure to a book, written by Nicholas Bound in 1595, which exercised a profound influence.

It is useful to note what has been common to the two traditions, that of the British Sunday and that of the Continental Sunday, and to note also where they diverge. They agree in their insistence that Sunday is a day when Christian people should assemble for worship; they agree that it should be a day of rest from ordinary labours, though the British gave to this a quality of taboo which was not found abroad. Where they have differed is with regard to the prevailing tone and with regard to the employment of such part of the day as was not given to devotions. In Great Britain amusements have been banned; on the Continent, including the Lutheran countries, they have been regarded as legitimate and appropriate. On the Continent Sunday has been unmistakably a festival; in Great Britain it is only in ecclesiastical language that it could be so described.

The British Sunday has been changing in character for nearly a century now, but it was not until the turn of the century that change became rapid. It has been part of that greater change of the British people from being one which accepted the tenets and the observances of Christianity to being one in which the majority of men and women have only hazy ideas as to what those tenets are, and pay little regard to Christian institutions. The Bishop of Birmingham deplored, when the opening of theatres seemed imminent, that we should have a pagan Sunday. One may ask whether a pagan Sunday is not appropriate to that majority of the English nation which is pagan.

In this matter of Sunday observance there are really two distinct questions which require answers. The first is how Sunday shall be observed by Christian men and women. The second is what should be made of Sunday by those who are not Christians. There is perhaps a third question, or set of questions, and that is what accommodations are needed in a society which is partly Christian and partly pagan.

With regard to the first question, the observance of Sunday by Christian men and women, it ought surely to be possible for the Churches to give a clear lead. But they do not give it. Whenever the subject is discussed the conservatives block any move towards adaptation to modern needs and modern ideas; they continue to talk about the thin end of the wedge when the thick end of the wedge is almost disappearing in the riven timber. For it is not only the frankly pagan majority of the population of this country which repudiates the nineteenth-century conception of Sunday; it is repudiated also by a large number who are sincere Christians and want to be loyal churchmen. They see no need, and do not intend, to attend services at eleven o'clock and at six-thirty, an arrangement which makes the rest of the day almost unutilisable. They see no harm, and much good, in Sunday recreation. But emphatically they do not want to see the distinction between Sunday and other days disappear, nor do they want it to become a weekly Bank Holiday. It ought to be possible to agree on a Christian Sunday other than the traditional British Sunday. It should include a period of public worship, which should be early in the day; and this should be made a matter of loyalty and, if neeessary, of Church discipline. It should be regarded as a day specially suitable for serious

thought and self-examination. But the restrictions on recreations should be cut out completely, so that Christian men and women, their devotions done, could play games or go to the country without a qualm of conscience. A Sunday so safeguarded and so liberated might have a stability which the present Sunday has not got.

And what of the rest of the population? If they do not admit the claims of Christianity there is no reason why they should be subjected to the discipline of its institutions, and the Christian Churches gain nothing by making the attempt. That does not mean that Sunday should disappear from our national life, even if the Christian minority should become much smaller. Sunday is deep in our tradition, and it has uses which can be divorced from religion. In the first place, it should be preserved as a day of rest for as many persons as possible. It is not possible to " stagger " Sunday without destroying its essential character; a weekly day of rest for everyone would not compensate for the loss of a national day of rest. In the second place, there is no reason why some special quality in the day should not be preserved; even those who reject the Christian faith would be all the better if on one day a week they gave some thought to the mystery of human existence, and to the problems of human destiny, and to the cultivation of their minds and of their finer sensibilities. For these reasons there might be some agreed restrictions on the use of the day, preserving some measure of quiet. Furthermore, there might be special facilities for cultural activities, a matter which the State, with its growing subsidization or control of education and of recreation, could well contrive. Sunday might become a day when it was specially easy to hear good music, to listen to good talks on the wireless, to visit places of beauty and of interest; and, conversely, when the more vulgar and trivial amusements were harder to come by.

There are needed, therefore, two new conventions. The Christian Churches should establish a convention, or conventions, for their adherents, and, having established it, they should see that it was observed; Church members would take, and would be all the better for, a stricter discipline. The second convention would be for those who make no profession of Christianity, and it would make of Sunday what we may call a secular solemn festival: secular, because it would have no basis in revealed religion; solemn, because it would preserve for Sunday a dignity and a meaning related

to the higher activities of man; a festival, because recreation would be recognized as one of its major purposes.

It is useless to suppose that the establishment of these conventions would be an easy matter; it would require hard thinking, persistent propaganda, and a willingness of both parties to accommodate to the desires and needs of the other. But they could be established. And what is the alternative? A disastrous policy of drift: the Churches adhering nominally to claims which they know they cannot enforce; a vast population outside the Churches fuming at illogical restrictions, uncertain of its duties, and left to commercial exploitation of its leisure. This would be something very much inferior to the Continental Sunday which we have despised. It is not good enough.

HENRY A. MESS.

SHORTER NOTICE

THE NEW CHRISTIAN YEAR. By Charles Williams. Oxford University Press. 5s.

Those who have made use of *The Passion of Christ* will be won in advance to this new book of devotion edited by Mr Williams. For every day of the Christian year he has chosen passages from the teachers and saints of the Christian Church; most of them are pregnant sayings of only a sentence or two. We wish that he had been able to provide *exact* references, for often one is incited to seek out the context of a quotation; also an index of authors would have been useful. Perhaps Mr Williams will meet these needs next time; for we are sure he has material for another book of this kind, which he must not be allowed to withhold.

A. R. V.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Canon Hubbard had been Vicar of All Saints, Margate, since 1921; for the duration of the war he was in charge of the country parish of Hothfield, near Ashford. He died suddenly in April last. He was one of the most keen and active collaborators in this journal, and his help will be much missed.

The Rev. Dr Lowther Clarke has been Editorial Secretary of the S.P.C.K. since 1915.

The Rev. H. F. D. Sparks, B.D., is a Lecturer in Theology in the University of Durham.

The Rev. R. de Bary is Vicar of Horton in the diocese of Salisbury.

Dr Mess is Reader in Sociology in the University of London; he was formerly Director of the Tyneside Council of Social Service.

The Rev. S. M. Gibbard was, until recently, Chaplain of St Boniface College, Warminster.

The Rev. H. I. Davies is a Lecturer at St David's College, Lampeter.

The Rev. L. J. Collins is now serving as a Chaplain with the Royal Air Force.

NOTES

The death of Mrs Selwyn, wife of the Dean of Winchester (founder and first editor of Theology) and sister of the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, will be felt almost as a personal loss by the older subscribers, to whom the individuality of the Editor meant so much. She was a gracious lady in every sense of the word; a wonderful home-maker, for whom, nevertheless, this earth was not her real home. *Requiescat in pace.*

With reference to the Kierkegaard Bibliography, which was published in Theology (May, 1941), the Rev. Hugh Joseph reports the recent publication in America of a further book—viz., *A Pastor looks at Kierkegaard*, by William T. Riviere, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Victoria, Texas (Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan). Mr John Short calls attention to the fact that there is a French translation of the *Diary of a Seducer*—viz., S. Kierkegaard, *Le Journal du Séducteur*. Traduit du danois par Jean J. Gateau. Introduction du traducteur. 1929. (Librairie Stock, Delamain et Boutelleau, Paris.) He also says that to the reviews and studies mentioned should be added the article by W. G. Moore, Fellow of St John's College, Oxford, which appeared in the *Hibbert Journal*, July, 1938.

Mr R. P. C. Hanson writes as follows from Trinity College, Dublin:

" May I point out two small mistakes in the May, 1941, issue of THEOLOGY?

" At the end of his interesting article on Archbishop Magee, the Rev. R. S. T. Haslehurst says (p. 281): ' and the writer would say of *The Gospel and the Age* and the other volumes of Magee what the children playing in a North African garden said to one another: " Take and read." ' Now if this is a reference to St Augustine's hearing the words, ' Tolle, lege,' just before his conversion (as it surely must be), there is an inaccuracy here. If Mr Haslehurst will consult St Augustine's *Confessions*, he will find that the saint was not converted in any town of North Africa, but in Milan.

" On page 304 of the same issue, the Rev. Thomas M. Parker, in a review of *Christianity and Classical Culture*, by C. N. Cochrane, has occasion to quote Horace; this is a laudable practice, but Mr Parker quotes the line as *Vixerunt fortes ante—et post—Agamemnona*. We may, of course, allow him to interpose his *et post*, but why should he not quote the rest of the line (which comes from Odes IV, ix, 25) correctly, as *Vixere fortes*, and thus offend those ears, which are sensitive to scansion, no more than is necessary?"

The series of " Revised Reviews " is not concluded, but will shortly be resumed.

THE CHURCH AND EVACUATION

THE large evacuation of September, 1939, and the subsequent movements of children and mothers from dangerous areas to safer places have brought more clearly before the majority of our people social and religious problems, which before the war seemed to be the concern only of a minority. These changes have been reviewed in many surveys, from Government circulars to Fabian Society studies; in most of these there are but slight allusions to the work of the Christian denominations in the evacuation and reception areas. This gap has been partly filled by articles in the religious periodicals; but in February, 1941, the S.C.M. Press published a survey of this whole field from the Christian point of view under the title *Evacuation and the Churches* (1s.). The survey was undertaken at the suggestion of the Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility.

" The object of the enquiry," the report states, " has been to gain a general picture of the situation created by evacuation, more particularly to discuss how the Church has figured and

functioned in it, and thence to discuss how the Church may better serve the community both while the evacuation lasts and afterwards " (p. 8).

The general policy of the Government is first examined. It was criticized from many angles, particularly before the heavy bombing began; but now nearly all observers regard it as a right decision, especially when it is remembered that this, like most war-time measures, is a choice among evils, and also that its object (as the Government stated) was not only " to save the lives of the children," but also " to lessen the problems of national civil defence and to preserve the morale of the people in the large cities." In the execution of this scheme, the transport was excellently carried through, but the arrangements for housing the evacuated population and for continuing the work of evacuation were defective. There were excuses for this failure in that there was no previous experience to draw upon, the numbers of those setting out on this voluntary evacuation were unknown until the day of departure, and the exact development of hostile air-attacks could not be foreseen (*e.g.*, the Government can hardly be blamed for regarding in 1939 Bristol as a " neutral " rather than an " evacuation " area). Yet there is no doubt that in this evacuation policy as in other ways we, as a nation, were not half prepared for this " total warfare ".

Bearing all this in mind, we may notice what from a Christian point of view were the chief defects of the evacuation. A much more thorough survey of the reception areas should have been made beforehand. The children might then have been placed in homes of approximately the same economic standard as their own, for there it seems that billeting has its greatest chance of success. Also members of one family would have had a greater probability of being kept together. Special homes for " difficult " children should have been secured in advance. This need was quickly recognized (*e.g.*, a home was opened with twenty of such children in Huntingdonshire on September 16, 1939), but more needs to be done on these lines. Such a preliminary survey also would have helped to give continuity of religious practice and instruction. This was left entirely to private enterprise or to chance. Some churches in evacuation areas with a considerable staff of clergy were able to send away one of their number for this purpose. We have also heard of privately arranged interchange of billets on a considerable scale to bring Roman Catholic children near to their church in villages in the West Country and also in a small Midland town. But the local ministers of religion were not consulted in this planning of the evacuation, nor even given a day's notice of the approximate number and types of evacuees they might expect. (It should be noticed that in the plans for the later scheme for overseas evacuation of children their spiritual welfare was adequately provided for.) The Ministry of Health Evacuation Memorandum

No. 4 mentions the Women's Voluntary Services, the National Council of Social Service, and women's institutes as voluntary organizations whose aid was to be sought; but it makes no mention of the Church.

This war-time evacuation has greatly complicated the task of education (*e.g.*, it has been said that twenty-six different educational authorities are now concerned with the children living in Wiltshire). Yet it seems that more careful preparation might have prevented some of the difficulties which have arisen. In the reception areas sometimes the " double shift " method was used, sometimes alternative accommodation was provided. In the former cases the plan often worked well, though visiting schools occasionally abused this hospitality (*e.g.*, we have heard of a visiting school installing a large stove and using it at the expense of the local authority without informing the local school managers). Where alternative accommodation has been arranged, small unsuitable church-halls and Scout huts often have been used, and school apparatus has generally been quite inadequate. More recently the local and evacuated schools have often been merged.

A further defect in the scheme was that no supervision was provided by the local education authorities for the many children who were not evacuated or who quickly returned to their homes. In several parishes in the evacuation areas the clergy showed initiative by running small voluntary schools. Then at the public demand the Board of Education opened schools first for voluntary and later for compulsory attendance; even now, in some places, compulsory attendance seems not to be enforced in practice. The two reasons which partly excused the tardiness of this action were the difficulty of providing schools with adequate shelters and the fear that such provisions would bring back more evacuated children. But these months of idleness and indiscipline probably have a good deal to do with the sharp rise of child delinquency.

Beneath many of the defects of the Government's scheme a serious error was " a scale of values in which physical safety was rated too high, and moral and spiritual welfare too low " (p. 19).

The next chapter of this book deals with general problems raised by its survey under three headings—administrative problems, prevalent social conditions revealed, and psychological effects of evacuation. It shows that the Government's scheme, apart from the actual transport, was marred by lack of foresight and preparation in the reception areas, but that this gap was often filled by improvisation by the Church and by voluntary agencies. For the future the report expects the State to take over more and more social work, which has previously been done or half done by voluntary organizations. If these organizations, which are largely connected with Christian bodies, function

adequately, they will be supported by the State. Clergy from all parts of the country testify how ready the State is now to co-operate in these ways on the new National Youth Committees set up by the Board of Education to care for youth between the ages of 14 and 18. This is certainly not an attempt to form a nationalist youth movement on Continental lines. The Church should give full and intelligent support to it.

The most challenging outcome of the evacuation was the revelation of the social conditions still prevailing in the poorer parts of our great cities in spite of all the efforts of the State's health services and the recent improvements in housing conditions. This should stir the Church and nation to demand much greater progress in these directions. Yet the report gives rather disturbing evidence on how little enthusiasm for social reform the evacuation has caused even among those who welcomed poorer children into their homes.

Possibly the most serious ill-effects of the evacuation will be psychological. The busy social worker is apt to overlook these; the children are only partly aware of them; foster-parents and teachers only notice the occasional oddness of behaviour in the evacuees which are seldom traced back to psychological maladjustments. Wise advice in these matters is easily accessible in *Children in War-time* (price 7d. from the New Educational Fellowship, 29, Tavistock Square, W.C.1). The seriousness of this problem is made clear in a pamphlet issued by the Industrial Christian Fellowship: " while the protection of its citizens is the duty of the State, if it is attempted by means which throw an unnatural strain on the family it is bound to create confusion and weakness in the very foundations of society. In thus defending itself from without, the community is opening the door to destruction from within."

A chapter is next devoted to what the Church actually has done in this field. The National Society issued almost at once a series of excellent pamphlets to advise the clergy and helpers in reception areas, published an admirable scheme for home religious teaching, and despatched skilled educationists to help on the spot. The corresponding nonconformist council for religious education did similar work. Indeed, these two bodies soon set up a war emergency committee for common action.

In most parishes in the evacuation areas church life has been seriously disorganized. At first about half of the children and a good number of mothers went away. Soon many returned, but a large number of these did not resume their religious practice. Church-going and social work have become increasingly difficult for adults and youth on account of the demands of National Service. Now intensive bombing has brought on further great disorganization (*e.g.*, it has been recently stated that 10 per cent. of the churches in the diocese of London cannot now be used). An account of experiment in

reorganization in Poplar (THEOLOGY, January, 1941) shows that the Church does not despair.

On the other hand the Church in the receiving areas has had magnificent, almost overwhelming, opportunities. From all types of Christian communities come reports that this opening was seized and used to the benefit both of the evacuated and local people. An unexpectedly happy experience of a group of Roman Catholic children settled in a markedly Protestant country district is recorded in the Dominican review *Blackfriars* (April, 1940).

It was not enough to welcome the evacuees into the local churches; much was generally needed to train them in the art of worship and build them into the local community. We have heard of good results of bringing children to a simple sung Parish Eucharist with a conductor in the nave of the church to give brief explanations and to lead the private devotions of the congregation. In one place where this was hardly practicable, after two or three preliminary instructions a series of special services was arranged; these were adapted from successive ceremonies of the Liturgy; the corresponding music from a simple setting for the Eucharist was learned at the same time. After two months of such training an eager evacuee congregation joined intelligently and most reverently in their first Eucharist. For eighteen months this has now been continued as a children's Eucharist with a lay-conductor for a considerable and steady congregation.[1] Elsewhere Sunday Schools and Catechisms have wisely concentrated on teaching the fundamental truths of Christian doctrine and simple practical methods of private prayer and public worship. On the other hand it is unpleasant to read that probably about a third of the churches in reception areas made no real attempt to welcome the evacuees.

The Christian denominations also filled a breach in the Government's scheme by providing canteens, social centres and clubs for their guests, often receiving great indirect benefit themselves. It has since been found generally desirable to merge evacuee activities, such as Scout troops, with the local organizations, partly because evacuation will probably be of longer standing than was at first anticipated, and partly through the war-time difficulty of securing youth leaders. To fill this last need one could wish that suitable men in the Services might be allowed to give temporary assistance.

The compilers of this report are disappointed that there has not been more co-operation between the different denominations in dealing with local problems; but they give a particularly encouraging example of it in Newport Pagnell, Bucks, where

[1] Further information about this and similar experiments can be obtained from Miss Phyllis Dent, of the National Society, at 60, Prestbury Road, Cheltenham.

twelve representatives from the Church of England and twelve from the Free Churches tried to link up nearly 900 evacuees with the appropriate local places of worship and youth organizations, and afterwards visited all the billets systematically. We have heard of several Roman Catholic groups being given the use of Anglican church halls.

Having summarized its survey, the report points out as an immediate need the setting up of local committees of responsible representatives of voluntary bodies concerned with social welfare (including, of course, the religious denominations, pp. 53-54). These committees would keep in touch with the Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility or some similar body. Such local co-ordinating bodies would seem to be most useful in social progress, for they could face the problems which are usually communal, they would be welcomed by the State as interdenominational bodies, they would have behind them the united Christian witness necessary for effective action. In September, 1939, probably many Government officials regarded the "churches" as rival denominational groups, a considerable proportion of which would fail to co-operate effectively. Had such social welfare committees been in existence at that time, the Government would probably have appealed for their help in the work of evacuation.

The report concludes with five far-reaching conclusions (pp. 57-59).

(i) A British victory will be useless without a rebirth of Christianity at home and abroad; hence the Church must press for a genuine recognition of this by the State in its legislation and administration.

(ii) Evacuation has brought into prominence defects in our social system. This call to further social progress must be kept before the nation by the Church.

(iii) New avenues of pastoral care and social service have been opened up. Clearly these must not be neglected as soon as the novelty of the evacuation scheme has worn off.

(iv) Closer co-operation is needed between the Christian denominations, other voluntary bodies for social services, and agencies with statutory authority.

(v) "The dynamic required for adequate Church action . . . will come into play, under God, in the measure in which Christians catch, communicate, and, above all, obey the heavenly vision of the Universal Church of Christ."

To these five conclusions we would add a sixth which probably the compilers assumed to underlie the others. As individuals and as congregations we need an ever-deepening penitence for our past indolence and self-centredness. This would give the energy of reparation and the sympathy of the penitent to our desire to seek and follow the will of God for His Church in this day of opportunity.

S. M. Gibbard.

THE SEPARATION BETWEEN NATURAL AND REVEALED THEOLOGY

This note is concerned with stating one or two senses in which natural and revealed theology cannot be separated. They can of course be separated in certain respects,[1] and it is desirable to separate them for certain purposes; they should be separated in so far as limitation of interest and corresponding abstraction are necessary conditions of all intellectual pursuits; they are also separable in the sense that natural theology is accepted by some persons who reject revealed theology and *vice versa*. (The tendency nowadays is either to reject both or to show scant sympathy for natural theology.[2] The old-fashioned rationalism which placed endless faith in natural theology has become less evident, and the kind of problem and the kind of hope that characterized liberal and non-traditional discussions of theology in the recent past have to-day a strange remoteness.) They must also be separated to guarantee that the "general revelation given to all men" is not confused "with the special revelation given . . . in the personal manifestation of the Word made Flesh".[3] But while one may agree that there are reasons of methodology and emphasis as well as reasons of tradition for the separation of both pursuits, there is still an important angle from which both must be viewed together. If the contention of this note is acceptable, there is a kind of divorce between both studies which can lead to serious confusion, and the avoiding of this confusion is a matter of special importance to those concerned with maintaining the *depositum fidei* as distinct from avowedly secular philosophers. The point at issue can be summarily stated. Without revealed theology natural theology may well attempt, and even succeed, in answering questions appertaining to the existence of God, the unity of God, God's moral government of the universe, the immortality of the soul, etc.; but the difficulty is that we have no guarantee at all that natural theology (divorced from revealed theology) means the same thing by God, unity, moral government, immortality, soul, etc., as revealed theology means when it employs these terms. It is notorious, for example, that a great deal of the difficulty in expounding philosophical systems derives from the fact that it just cannot be assumed that the philosophical analysis of what is meant by the same verbal symbol is identical for all systems (that is, when the same verbal symbols appear in different systems). *E.g.*, the philosophical analysis of the notion, God, would be different in the philosophies of St Thomas Aquinas and Alexander; the same would be true

[1] These points are clearly made by Fr Mascall in Theology, February, 1941, pp. 79 *ff.* [2] This remark is not true of Roman theology and neo-Thomism, but it is true of general philosophical discussion and "Reformed" theology. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

of the phrase " moral government of the universe " (or a like phrase) in the philosophies of Aristotle and Kant—and also of the notion of " immortality " in different philosophical discussions. If this difficulty is to be found in philosophy proper, can we then assume that it does not appear in natural theology when this branch is divorced from the whole corpus of theological study? It is not merely a matter of the *content* of the terms being less rich (*e.g.*, in soteriological significance); there is a sense in which that is to be expected, and herein lies one justification for the separation of both pursuits. The difficulty goes much deeper; it may well be the case that the terms in a natural theology (which is separated from revelation) would signify something quite incompatible with what they signify in revealed theology. For instance, it may well be the case that the term " God " is used in different senses by different thinkers pursuing natural theology (*e.g.*, contrast the Deists and the subsequent writers of the Romantic Movement), and it may well be the case also that none of these senses is compatible with the sense in which the term is a term of revealed theology. It is not being contended that such confusions always manifest themselves, but it is clearly theoretically possible for it to happen with terms whose philosophic analysis is so difficult. This is one reason why the philosophy of religion can degenerate into nothing better than the description of ideologies unless a careful analytic method is pursued. It is a matter of importance to the Church to realize the danger that the terms of her theology may be misrepresented to the world at large, and if this danger is not made explicit it suggests that the Church has not grasped the nature of her teaching commission.

If the argument pursued above is valid, then there cannot be a separation between natural and revealed theology which encourages the assumption that any natural theology can serve as a prolegomena to revealed theology. The Church must hold that natural theology, as a pursuit encouraged by the Church, derives its prerogative from revealed theology and not primarily from independent observation and certainly not from speculation. There is sometimes a certain nervousness on the part of the Church to say this, but it is not easy to see why this nervousness exists if the Church honestly accepts revealed theology as setting forth both the grounds for her existence and the genius of her life. This claim must not be parodied to mean that natural theology is an exercise directed towards bolstering up something unreflectively accepted as true. Theology does not ask us to give hostages to stupidity. Revealed theology must state its doctrines unambiguously, and this entails stating in what determinate senses it is asserting its doctrines; when this has been done, then natural theology can set itself questions that are apt, and it can inquire how far there is an element in our knowledge of God which derives from natural sources. But it must not be assumed that

to state the doctrines of revealed theology unambiguously and clearly is merely an abstract intellectual pursuit; these doctrines attain an increased delicacy and sensitiveness only in so far as the theologian lives and loves God, in so far as he lives the life of grace in the Church, where those " who were before spiritually left-handed now become right-handed as to the things of God ".[1] To realize these points is to be freed from the danger of pride that sometimes goes hand in hand with an unrestrained desire to innovate irrespective of tradition. This way of viewing matters will probably be criticized by those who are prepared to argue that there are two completely separate chapters in theology, " the first chapter being natural knowledge and the more advanced chapter being revealed knowledge "[2]; but this way of viewing the matter is surely unreal, and the unreality of the approach can be seen once we ask ourselves: " Is it only after a laborious pursual of natural theology that the saints and doctors of the Church have come by their passionate assurance of God's reality ?"[3] If so, it is very strange and very precarious, and a formal fallacy in the logic of their natural theology would have disastrous consequences.

H. Islwyn Davies.

NEW TESTAMENT SURVEY

At an R.A.F. station it is not easy to keep up to date in New Testament studies. I must be forgiven, then, if my second survey on recent literature about the New Testament is inadequate and if it shows some ignorance on my part of what has happened recently.

An outstanding event since my last survey was written has been the publication, posthumously, of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns' commentary on St John's Gospel, with its admirable introduction by Noel Davey, the editor of the book. A review has already appeared in this journal; but I make no apology for again mentioning it. It is a really important contribution in English to the study of the New Testament, and it has not always received its fair share of acknowledgment; in some cases it has been reviewed without understanding. Particularly lacking in sympathy and insight was the review which appeared in the *Sunday Times* over the signature of the Dean of St Paul's.

Many of us believed that Hoskyns was too strongly influenced by Karl Barth, and some of us believed that in his latter days he

[1] Matthias Faber's Easter Sermon. He was curé of St Maurice and Professor of Theology at Ingoldstadt; flourished 1620. [2] See Baillie's *Our Knowledge of God*, pp. 127 *ff.*, for a criticism of this view. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

was occasionally wild in his statements. But his lectures on the Theology of the New Testament were, and will remain, an inspiration to those who had the privilege of sitting under him. At a time when the Cambridge Theological Faculty was in danger of killing interest and enthusiasm in the study of the New Testament Hoskyns brought to the subject a new vision and a new method of approach. He broke from traditional English lines of exegesis, and insisted that only through faith in the Word of God can the mind of man grasp the real meaning of the Scriptures. The exegete must apply to the Scriptures the full powers of an acutely critical mind; but without a living faith in their significance they defy true explanation. The commentator's chief concern is not with critical propositions but with the laying bare of the meaning of what the authors actually wrote; theology must be made to conform to the Word of God.

This approach to the study of the New Testament is exploited by Hoskyns in his commentary. To fail to recognize this fact, and yet to scold him for not doing exactly what he had no intention of doing, is obscurantism at its worst. If, in the light of Westcott's work on the Fourth Gospel, this commentary should fail to convince a critic of its merit, it were well and good to say so; but let that critic first realize that Hoskyns deliberately makes a different approach from that of Westcott, and let him fairly evaluate the relative merits of the two approaches before he makes his judgment. The Dean of St Paul's seems to be unaware that the two commentators were working on quite separate lines from each other, and he is dissatisfied with the one because his work is not a reflection of the other's; he fails to discern the main problem for discussion in comparing the two.

Apart from Hoskyns' posthumous work there have passed through my hands for review four little books in English of considerable merit and importance. *Render unto Cæsar*[1] by the late Herbert Loewe, Reader of Rabbinics in the University of Cambridge, is a work of much interest and scholarship. Clearly worked out, it moves to a predetermined end: the question asked by the Jews of our Lord about tribute money was quite sincere, the story having been coloured by later anti-Jewish feeling. The Jew felt a real difficulty over the tribute money on account of the possibility of being involved in idolatry. Jesus was questioned, as any other Rabbi, on His attitude to this very vital problem in genuine regard for His opinion. There is a wealth of material in Rabbinic literature to show the importance of the controversy; and the answer given by Jesus is quite in accordance with precepts laid down by some of the Rabbis. That the book is founded upon exact knowledge and appreciation of Jewish literature and Jewish practices is evident throughout.

Paul and his Predecessors,[2] by A. M. Hunter (the Hastie Lectures

[1] Cambridge University Press, 6s. [2] Nicholson and Watson, 4s. 6d.

for 1939), has as its purpose " to take Paul out of his Apostolic insularity and to set him in the midst of early Christianity ". The author has, I think, made out a good case for his thesis; particularly valuable is his chapter on St Paul's conception of Christ, giving evidence as it does that this conception is founded upon the common heritage of primitive Christian witness. In the chapter dealing with Baptism and the Lord's Supper there is an interesting criticism of the view held by Leitzmann that in 1 Cor. xi we find an idea of Paul's creating, the linking of the Lord's Supper or early Breaking of Bread with the Last Supper, the result of special revelation to Paul. Hunter finds grounds for believing that St Paul is in 1 Cor. xi reciting something which was already current in the Church before he joined it. I am surprised that more is not made by the author of the possibility that St Stephen influenced St Paul to a great extent. (There is a misprint on page 81, footnote 2, where Gal. vi 4 should be read Gal. vi 14.)

The Theology of Jesus,[1] by A. T. Cadoux, is a solid and useful contribution to the study of the Synoptic Gospels. The author deliberately confines himself to what is recorded in the first three Gospels; but the reasons he gives for doing so seem to me to be hardly adequate. Can we form a true impression of the theology of Jesus without taking into consideration the Fourth Gospel? It is true that the Church has tended to rely for its theology mainly on the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles, " so that those who clung to traditional theology were not prepared to recognize its distance from the thought of Jesus as preserved in the earlier records,[2] while others regarded theology as religion at some remove from reality and so not to be found in His words "; but this is no valid reason for going to the other extreme.

The point of view of the author is clear throughout: there is a tendency to minimize the apocalyptic elements in our Lord's teaching, to suggest a humanistic bias in the Gospels wherever possible, and to " liberalize " the theology of Jesus. The point of view is particularly evident in Chapters vii and viii, concerned respectively with *Human Nature* and *Himself*: the former proceeds from the assumption that " there is no hint in His teachings of that which has been so important in Christian theology—the fall of man ", an assumption which moulds the author's exegesis throughout the rest of the chapter; the latter displays lack of imagination, particularly in its treatment of the Evangelists and of the question of the transmission in the early Church of the Gospel material. Chapter x, *Jesus and Men*, fails I think to show sufficient appreciation of the importance of Grace in the

[1] Nicholson and Watson, 9s. 6d. [2] In this statement Cadoux makes a tacit presupposition in regard to the theological relationship existing between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. There will be many who will agree with me in questioning this assumption.

theology of Jesus. But the " liberal " outlook of Cadoux in this book is in some measure balanced by his insistence throughout that goodness in man is a gift from God and not an attainment of man's own.

The Primitive Christian Catechism,[1] by Philip Carrington, is a thoroughly useful little book. It is a pity that it had to be so small in size. The object of the book is to throw some light on primitive Christian catechetical practice by an examination of parallels in the teaching sections of the Epistles. In these parallels the author sees as a background a relatively fixed form. There is no attempt to reconstruct the actual generic text, but only to insist that a pattern exists. From a consideration of this pattern Dr Carrington draws certain conclusions about the likely form of a primitive Christian baptismal rite. This work of the Bishop of Quebec may be studied with profit alongside such a book as *St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, by Wilfred L. Knox, and the works of Form-critics of the Gospels.

Among other books which have passed through my hands has been one, *The Messianic Consciousness of Jesus*,[2] by H. G. Hatch, which, I suppose, should be considered an attempt at a serious theological work. But it is a poor contribution to the study of the problem with which it deals. It has little to recommend it. The author's objectivity of judgment must be questioned, and his bibliography seems to be inadequate. A confusion between the terms eschatological and apocalyptic, a failure to reckon with the Fourth Gospel, an assumption that the baptism of Jesus was the crucial point in His experience, and a too frequent use of " doubtless " or " no doubt " are some of the weaknesses which are apparent throughout the book.

As always, there has been a number of books of lesser importance published, written for the ordinary man unqualified as a New Testament scholar, who is interested in modern developments in the study of the New Testament. Among these is a very inadequate and altogether too " slick " work by A. W. F. Blunt, *The Teaching of the New Testament*.[3] A far more worthy little book is *The Epistle of Christian Courage*,[4] by E. G. Selwyn. This essay should prove of much value to the Christian who desires to " give answer to every man that asketh you a reason concerning the hope that is in you ". *And Pilate said*,[5] by Frank Morison, and *The Man from Heaven*,[6] by A. C. Garrett, are both worth reading. *The Gospel of St John*,[7] by R. F. Bailey, should be a useful commentary for schools.

L. J. Collins.

[1] Cambridge University Press, 7s. 6d. [2] S.P.C.K., 6s. [3] S.P.C.K., 1s. 9d. [4] Mowbrays, 2s. [5] Rich and Cowan, 10s. 6d. [6] Allen and Unwin, 8s. 6d. On page 3 we read: " In every religion save Christianity, God, however real may be His protection of and care of His people, is essentially and fundamentally a Ruler, Sheikh, Sultan, or King." This is a modest example of the irresponsibility of the writer in this book. [7] S.C.M. Press, 5s.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE NATURE OF THOUGHT. By Brand Blanshard. 2 vols. Allen and Unwin. 32s.

THE PROBLEMS OF LOGIC. By A. P. Ushenko. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

Nowadays the term " Idealism " is apt to be used, particularly in circles touched by " realistic theology ", as a stick with which to beat a surprising variety of dogs. For those who wish to avoid such loose uses of the term, and yet to try to make up their minds where their real quarrel with Idealism lies, Professor Blanshard's book is most welcome and timely. It contains the most thorough and persuasive account of the main Idealist doctrines which has yet appeared. To read it is to be reminded of the best which Oxford tried—not always successfully—to teach us. It is in the direct succession of Bradley and Bosanquet, but written without Bosanquet's turgidity or Bradley's captiousness—what Professor Blanshard calls Bradley's " Bluebeard style ". (Personally I thoroughly enjoy Bradley's Bluebeard style, but I recognize that it may distract from a critical reading of the argument.) Professor Blanshard's own writing is clear, pungent and urbane—some of the best philosophical prose which has been written in this generation. He starts with an appraisal of the contribution of empirical psychology to the study of thinking, and gives us a devastating exposure of certain pseudo-scientific psychological philosophies. He goes on to a thorough examination of the possible alternatives—realist, pragmatist, positivist—to the Idealist position. Thereby he fortifies me in a conclusion which I reached when I first read Bradley—that when it comes to an examination of what we actually seem to be doing on the perhaps rare occasions when we like to believe we are thinking, the Idealist logic and epistemology wins hands down over Realist epistemology or formal logic. Once we leave the mathematical disciplines, Idealist epistemology goes deeper into the way in which a mind seeks to formulate problems and find answers by a process of weighing evidence which cannot be covered by formal rules of implication. It considers thought as the clarification of ideas within the context of an implicit system which we develop through the process of clarification, rather than, as the realists would maintain, as the addition of one nugget of directly " apprehended " truth to another. Therefore—and this is Professor Blanshard's central thesis—thought is essentially purposive, and its purpose is no ulterior one, but that of achieving more adequate systematic understanding. Its goal is the complete articulation of reality—a goal in which thought is itself the individual system of reality, completely articulated and self-conditioned. It is at this point that I begin to get uncom-

fortable, and Professor Blanshard has not removed the discomfort. Apart from the question of whether the real *is* an individual all-inclusive system (and in spite of Professor Blanshard's generous interpretation of the doctrine of internal relations, I do not think this is yet proven), I do not believe that anyone, not even Professor Blanshard, has made the doctrine of the " concrete universal " sufficiently clear to show how thought in its completion could actually *be* that individual system. If it were, it would have to be like Sylvie and Bruno's map—as large as the country. And then why have a map ? I trust the instinct of the earlier Bradley of the *Logic* in refusing to identify the real with any system of ideas; and if the later Bradley of *Appearance and Reality* looked to the passing of thought into reality, this could only be effected by its ceasing to be thought—whatever that means. Thinking as we know it is always something less than the real—a selective systematization of certain aspects and relations within the real in terms of some symbolism which, as symbolism, must be an abstraction.

Moreover, when Professor Blanshard writes of an idea as a " purpose seeking its own fulfilment " (namely, identity with its object), or, Aristotelian-wise, as " a potential seeking actualization ", I am left wondering how far these expressions are meant literally. If he appeals to Aristotle for the principle of development as the actualizing of potency, we may also appeal to him for the principle that potencies can only be actualized by the agency of something already actual. Does Professor Blanshard conceive of ideas as somehow real agencies " seeking their fulfilment " ? I do not think so. If not, then the agencies through which they are actualized are living minds. True, if they are really thinking, minds must develop ideas according to order immanent in the ideas themselves—hence logic. But here is the real issue for Idealist metaphysics. Is the mind a medium through which an idea can be developed until it reaches its goal in a through-and-through penetration of the world in thought? Or does reality comprise substances whose individuality is a genuine logical surd, to be described perhaps analogically, but which no concepts, however far developed, can completely absorb ? Religious suspicions of Idealism may address themselves properly to such questions. But they would be addressed to the Idealist view of the nature of reality and the relation of thought to reality rather than to its account of the nature of thought. The latter is a profound and sustained attempt to describe the movement of ideas, a movement which may be none the less constructive even if its goal in an Absolute Idea is one which (as Bradley knew in his heart) *οὐκ ἄν εἴη πρακτὸν οὐδὲ κτητὸν ἀνθρώπῳ.*

Mr Ushenko's book is more limited in scope, and perhaps a little misleading in its title. It deals with certain selected logical problems in the form in which they are at present under

discussion between followers of the " conventionalist " (logical positivist) school and " intuitionists ", following the view of formal logic of the *Principia Mathematica*. The book is therefore. not, like Professor Blanshard's, comprehensive and self-explanatory, but would be of interest to those who are concerned with these somewhat technical controversies—*e.g.*, the vexed question of " alternative logics " (here I think Professor Blanshard is right: the so-called alternative logics can be shown to be alternative ways of symbolizing the same logical rules). Mr Ushenko himself is an intuitionist who combines a realist view of formal logic with an element of Kantianism. In the latter respect he seems to be putting half a foot over into Professor Blanshard's camp. (If he were pressed as to what he meant by a " fact," *e.g.*, on p. 174, he might have to put it further over.) In spite of some fairly acute argument in the final chapter, which raises the more general problem of the nature of logic, he does not convince us that a logic of propositions as objective and constant units of thought is more adequate to our actual thinking than the logic of " judgments ". But he makes a suggestive remark on p. 148, that the Hegelian type of logic may have to do with the creation of ideas, the propositional logic with their exposition.

Dorothy M. Emmet.

Manchester.

Witchcraft. By Charles Williams. Faber and Faber. 12s. 6d.

I have never felt very sure that it is for our souls' health to rake up the terrible and sordid story of the warfare between Western civilization and the archaic evil in its own soul, which took shape in witchcraft and even more in the panic fear of witchcraft. Even in the hands of a romantic master like John Buchan the picture of a coven is a hideous one, and the writings of such an expert as Dr Montague Summers, with all their admirable and painstaking scholarship, are far more likely to produce in the reader an obsession with the ugliest aspects of the occult than to encourage a sincere and rational interest in one of the strangest and most humiliating chapters in human history. The subject is really one for the medical psychologist and for the spiritual director, whose business it is to know about the dark places in the human soul, and I am bound to say that I doubt whether the general circulation even of the most healthy-minded books about it ought to be encouraged.

Having said so much I must add that it would be difficult to imagine a more sane and healthy-minded treatment of witchcraft than this which Mr Charles Williams has given us. He has both a sense of historical proportion and, as we should expect from his other writings, a profound mystical insight which enables him to pass behind the incredible record of obscenities and

cruelties and to disentangle the pathetic and often courageous striving of the human spirit which is its true background.

As a piece of historical writing the book is very well done. The material is chosen with discretion from the superabundance of evidence, and the story, as a whole and in the individual cases selected, seems to tell itself. The picture is perhaps over-simplified. It starts with the Greco-Roman world, with its mysteries and crudities, and shows the Christian community struggling with an increasing pressure of popular superstition and, later, of increasing and irrational suspicion. Yet behind the suspicion there was some real unity of thought and practice. Mr Williams does not deal with the problem of the extent to which there was a real survival of ancient pagan religious practices. That does not really affect his main purpose, which is to show how the Christian tradition stood the emotional strain. What becomes clear is that neither the influence of the devil nor the powers of heroic endeavour and of mystical questing were all on one side. St Joan of Arc comes near being classed as a witch, and was certainly burnt as one, and her flamboyant admirer, Gilles de Rais, became one of the most sinister figures of black magic. Madame de Montespan, when her vicious circle of associates was broken up, ended her days with some appearance of heroic sanctity. The devil certainly had his way in the horrible cruelty to which fear drove Church and State alike. Yet it was the Church which first asserted, in the *Canon Episcopi*, the rational duty of disbelief, and which, in the end, reaffirmed that same duty. The record of the Spanish Inquisition, especially in the person of Salazar, stands out alike in its reasonableness and in its charity, and marks the beginning of the return to sanity of which the world, apart from Christianity, seemed quite incapable. The storm was fundamentally a psychological one, a mass-hysteria capable of lasting for two nightmare centuries and of causing hundreds of thousands of deaths, mostly of innocent people. Once the hysteria passed, broken upon the good sense of men like Salazar and de la Regnie, and upon the pity and penitence of the Salem jurors, the actual nucleus of evil practice became dangerous only to the few who indulged in it. The world as a whole went free, until the day came for other evil dreaming.

Oxford. L. W. Grensted.

Lord Halifax. By Stuart Hodgson. Christophers. 10s. 6d.

"He is a singular man in British affairs, a man who holds office not through political skill, not through mass appeal, not through any gift of looking like nor sounding like a people's leader, but through character. Lord Halifax stands to some

extent above the political battle. He is the one man in the Cabinet whose resignation, if it were offered over an issue of principle, could bring down the Government."

These words of Raymond Gram Swing, the American publicist, which are quoted in this book, give an explanation of Lord Halifax's career. Hardly has it ever appeared that he was the one obvious man for the particular appointment which he received. He may have failed in some of his tasks, but he never sought high office for himself. He has always moved about the political world with an air of detachment. Yet he does not stand aloof from human relationships; only from any personal ambition.

The career of Lord Halifax is a remarkable one. A holder of great Cabinet offices culminating in the Foreign Secretaryship, Viceroy of India and Ambassador to the United States, his record as a statesman is notable. But there are other sides to his achievements. He is a sportsman, a man of letters and a religious leader. He is also—and this is probably one of his greatest joys—Chancellor of Oxford University. Mr Hodgson has made clear in this book his subject's great and enduring love for the fair city and University of Oxford. "What a different world it would have been if Hitler and Goering had been to Oxford."

Behind this life of strenuous work, and giving to it its peculiar significance, is the character of Lord Halifax himself. Here his biographer has been specially illuminating. He has traced the influences which have moulded this strong and gracious personality. Greatest of all is the Christian Church, in which Lord Halifax was brought up and of which he is so devoted a son. It is as a Christian statesman that he makes his special contribution in the world of affairs to-day. He is, moreover, a true Englishman with the characteristics of his Yorkshire ancestry strongly developed in him. Mr Hodgson's discriminating book gives us the picture of a Christian Englishman fitted by birth, training and outlook to bring our Anglo-Saxon tradition at its best to the tasks of war-making and peace-building.

HOTHFIELD. H. L. HUBBARD.

THE POETRY OF YEATS. By Louis Macneice. Oxford University Press. 8s. 6d.

William Butler Yeats never grew old. He never grew old in the same sense that Cicero and Brahms, for instance, could never have been young; and, after some fifty years of creative fertility, he was not only producing work that was fresh and vital, but distilled into his poetry, at the end of his life the grey daylight of a new age that was dawning—the essence of something that he did not live to see and perhaps has been blighted at its birth. Born in the heyday of the Victorian era, he lived to see

the golden sunset of its Edwardian aftermath, the night of a Great War and the twilight that succeeded it; but through it all he preserved an artistic detachment, a neutral assurance that enabled him to objectify, even to distil, our phases and stages—dishing them up according to the methods of our own technique. Wilde, Newbolt, Owen, Eliot, and Auden have all stood for something in that process of our transformation—something vital to its being and continuation; but in the poetry of Yeats we have a microscopic distillation of the whole essence. Mr Louis Macneice, near the end of his book, says:

"Yeats' vision of poetry, as we have seen, underwent modifications during his life. As most poets do, he throve on theological half-truths. He began by requiring 'beauty' in the popular, narrower sense and 'passion' in the Romantic sense, abjuring the intellect and rhetoric and everyday moods and ideas and contemporary subjects. Yet, whatever he may have thought of himself, he was never merely a poet of passion; his intellect was always involved in a Platonic search for universals. During his nationalist period he maintained that the nationalist poet is concerned with permanent values, whereas the 'contemporary' poet is concerned only with the ephemeral and the irrelevant. Later he admitted that nationalism can sidetrack the poet into narrowness, aridity, and even hypocrisy, while he conceded that the contemporary world must be faced, for 'every man everywhere is more of his time than of his nation'."

Thus Mr Macneice puts his finger on the button. The whole story is there in a nutshell—the story of Wilde, Kipling and Auden; and the whole thing happened in the mind of a single poet. It is fitting that Mr Macneice, who recently wrote a book to show us that the poet should express the conscience of his age, should here unveil the mind of a poet who found himself at home in at least four ages, the first and the last of which were alike at least in one respect—that the poet was, as he has again become, a priest without a congregation. He disarms us at the outset of his critical study by exclaiming:

"If I were making a general anthology of shorter English poems, I should want to include some sixty by W. B. Yeats. There is no other poet in the language from whom I should choose so many. This being so, I felt it would be merely academic for me to discuss at length whether Yeats was or was not a great poet or in spending much time in trying to rank him. I am not interested in ranking poets and I am not even very much interested in greatness *per se*. The poets who interest me are the poets whom I like re-reading. I like re-reading Yeats more than I like re-reading most English poets. This is why I undertook to write a book about his poetry; I wished to find out why Yeats appealed to me so much and I hoped also to present Yeats sympathetically to others."

The book, one may therefore assume, is intended as an apology; but in actual fact it is a good deal more—even if unintended. For Mr Louis Macneice could hardly estimate the quality of Yeats without touching and probing and prodding and plumbing

a good deal of English poetry for the past fifty years—pillaging by the way; and it is just here that we come upon the secret of Yeats' power almost unawares. For while the operation shows one poet after another to have perished in the effort of creation and have become a more or less respectable corpse in process of time, Yeats was still young when he had seen them all into the grave; and he might have added one more wreath to the grave of clay that at last received his body. For even if it be true that neither Housman nor de la Mare ever grew old, one escaped it by a regression into paganism and the other by a diversion into fantasy. Yeats was a realist to the end—to the bitter end.

St. Anne's-on-Sea. Ashley Sampson.

Christianity or Chaos. By Ethel Mannin. Jarrolds. 7s. 6d.
A Faith to Fight For. By John Strachey. Gollancz. 6s.
Faith for Living. By Lewis Mumford. Secker and Warburg. 7s. 6d.

Miss Mannin has been living in the West of Ireland and her book, *Christianity or Chaos: A Restatement of Religion*, has been inspired by beauty she has found in the life of the Irish peasantry. Though it is questionable whether her pages are as communicative of the spirit of the far west as she would hope, it is true that her book is not lacking in fine feeling. Living among the Irish and contemplating from their midst the world catastrophe, she has become convinced of the validity and the necessity of the religious life. She seems, indeed, to be much attracted by Catholicism, and in many ways the book suggests that it may be the product of a mind in transition. There is a sensation of wandering backwards and forwards between Christianity and the views of the progressive modern: the word "God", for instance, is written sometimes with, and sometimes without, the inverted commas. The result, while not exactly confusing, and while certainly interesting, is somewhat inconclusive. Pleas for catholic worship and catholic wisdom are intertwined, and inclined to jostle with commendations of Anarcho-syndicalism, *Ahimsa* and easy divorce. It would be altogether too easy to say that there is more chaos than Christianity in the book, but it must be admitted that it is hardly accurate to describe it as a "restatement of religion". There is no restatement because there is no synthesis. To equate God with Life, as she does, is too indiscriminate to be helpful. There is no synthesis because there is no real criticism. Although Miss Mannin knows a lot about Christianity, she does not know enough to be able to criticize it as effectively as she criticizes many other things, including some popular travesties of Christian doctrine. She is determined to hold that to follow the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount does not involve membership of any Church or

subscription to any orthodoxy. She insists that truth is neutral, that one religion is as good as another, that orthodoxies blight the mind. She trounces Mr Middleton Murry for saying that "it is man's privilege that he alone among organisms must learn slowly and painfully to be an organism". She has read with approval the prophets of orthodoxy, Maritain, Berdyaev, Chesterton and Dawson. It is conceivable that she might have been happier had she read some theology, had she looked out, for instance, the meaning of the doctrine of Original Sin, which she misunderstands, and had she probed the issue between an Immanentist and a Transcendentalist view of the Deity. The doctrine of Original Sin is not an insult to human nature, nor is the Immanentist-Transcendentalist issue an abstract one.

In comparison with both Mr Strachey and Mr Mumford, Miss Mannin is closer to the Faith in that she instinctively perceives its inner spirit. But she does not perceive, as they appear to do, the extent and the nature of the inroads which the world-view of historic Christianity must inevitably make into the advanced doctrines of modern thought. Her mind and her position are less definite and consistent than theirs, and her book is more obviously about herself than about the world situation as focused by the war.

It is said that Mr Strachey's book, *A Faith to Fight For*, represents something like a conversion, but what exactly he has been converted to is the less obvious in consequence of the fact, first, that his book is avowedly the world crisis shown to the children, and, second, that it is also in large measure directed against his recent associates ("supremely clever fools"), the adherents of the Communist Party Line. The book is certainly not a declaration of adherence to orthodox Christianity. It might be described as an exposition,in elementary outline, of Christian ethics regarded as separable from Christian theology. But when all allowances have been made for the fact that the book is an essay in simplification for the benefit both of the childlike and of the childish, it seems that there is in it a strain of naivety, of excessive logical simplicity, of a thin and rather querulous dogmatism. Briefly, Mr Strachey is concerned to advocate Truth and Love, to declare that Untruth and Hate are not a monopoly of reactionary Capitalists, and to explain that, unless we are converted to Truth and to Love, we shall achieve neither social reform nor victory in the war. In such a cause, hyperbole and the dramatic treatment of the lights and shades are the legitimate resort of the advocate, and the critic is at a disadvantage. But there is at least a faint absurdity in the statement that in Socialism there was discovered the key to history, and in the claim that Socialism is one of the greatest truths that has ever been discovered. There is at least a faint absurdity in the statement, "our defeat or victory in this war turns on whether we in time begin to serve the truth."

Mr Strachey claims that just as the physicist came to under-

stand thunder and so to control the electrical forces which produce it, so the Socialist, by grasping the processes of history, has enabled mankind to control the forces at work in it. Thunder seems to be an unfortunate analogy. Much, no doubt, is known about thunder, but nobody, it would appear, has succeeded in starting or stopping a thunderstorm. It may be suggested that, while modern historical or sociological science has achieved great insight into economic and social forces, nobody should suppose that history is now " controllable " in the sense that some natural processes are controllable. The point is not that Marxist sociology is necessarily inconsistent with the Eternal Verities; it is rather that the doctrinaire logic which it seems to breed is the wrong sort of logic to apply to human affairs. When Mr Strachey moves forward to discuss Love, he proceeds to argue that the Roman Empire was undermined by the charitable fervour of the Christians. The reader begins to regret the author's abandonment of the thorough-going Marxist interpretation of history. He pays the Church the compliment (which we think exaggerated) of claiming that it was the love generated by it which abolished the slavery of the ancient world. Emphasizing (we think unduly) the social achievement of the Church, he neglects its intellectual and moral achievement in its doctrine and cult of the personal life—its science of the soul. On any showing, it would seem to have been the latter rather than any appreciable approximation to social equality which constitutes the major observable achievement of the Church—that, and its contribution to political order and its preservation of an intellectual inheritance. It was an achievement in the realm of Truth rather than one in the realm of Love. The truth Mr Strachey is concerned with is the truth about Nature and the truth about Society: he is also concerned with the truth about Man, expounding as he does the moral obstacles to knowledge and the corrupting effects of power. But far as he has gone, he has not gone so far as to grasp in its implications the fact that the truth about man must be prior in sociology to all other truths, omitting for present purposes the fact that this priority can only be secured if it be part of the priority of the truth about God.

A science of nature and a science of society with nothing but a vestigial science of man is characteristic of modern thought, whatever it calls itself, and its deficiencies and attendant consequences are brilliantly and vigorously delineated by Mr Lewis Mumford in his *Faith for Living*. Mr Mumford distinguishes between what he calls Ideal Liberalism and what he calls Pragmatic Liberalism, that degeneration of the former which is an aspect of the present disquieting situation. He writes without illusions. In addition to Liberalism, he criticizes the various Traditionalisms. He insists that there can be no easy or short way out. His positive proposals, moreover, at least in the social

and political spheres, are, in the main, realistic. His book is the best of the three. It is all the more disappointing to find, when he moves on to elucidate the ultimate grounds of his faith for living, that he declines from the standard maintained in the more destructive sections of the book. His performance at this point ceases to radiate light, while sustaining a slight rise in temperature. This incoherence, albeit eloquent and uplifting, is embarrassing in one who admits the need for rational precision in establishing " a central core of purpose ". His doctrine, so far as it can be pieced together at all, seems to be a doctrine of Immanentism or Pantheism. He alludes once to " the marvellous Being who encloses us ", and mentions the power not ourselves which makes for righteousness. But it is not clear whether this Divinity permeates the world of Nature in addition to informing the world of society. Miss Mannin's Deity was at least coterminous with Life. " Man's chief purpose . . . is the creation and preservation of values "—the essential stuff of society. So, in Mr Mumford's scheme, Man has union with the Social God. He admits the reality of sin, castigating the Pragmatic Liberals for ignoring it, but he seems to give it a merely social reference. He speaks of grace, but this too seems to be some sort of social emanation. His religion is a " synthesis of cults and creeds ". His church is an undefined " reservoir of social life—the Grand Coulee Dam of our whole culture ", the focus of all the values (art, religion, science, love, etc.). This institution, if institution he intends it to be, is charged with the task of " revamping " the tradition of Ideal Liberalism, of instigating " our philosophic reorientation ". We doubt whether all this is much more than " morality tinged with emotion ", even if the emotion be a strong one. Perhaps Mr Mumford intends to subscribe Matthew Arnold's definition of religion, since he makes use of his definition of the Deity. But we should be surprised to find such complacency in a writer so acutely conscious of the difference between the nineteenth century and the twentieth.

It would be unfortunate if such books as these were to be treated with smug superiority by Christians. For in so far as they represent in their own way a return to religion or at least a return to the consideration of religion or of something like it, it is a return for which the general situation rather than the virtue of Christians is mainly responsible. Secondly, their deficiencies are largely due to the unimaginative mentality of Christian orthodoxy in recent times. But deficiencies they have, and they are important. These authors have none of them (not even Mr Strachey, who, unlike the others, does not say that he wants the more religious parts of religion) travelled far enough along the road they have chosen for it to be possible for them to reach their own declared objectives. They none of them recognize the full implications of their aim. The main

reason for this is that they have taken this road because they have observed the consequences of the general deviation from it. They return to religion or to something like it because they believe that the world is what it has become because religion or something like it has been very generally ignored. Basically, their approach and their conclusions are empiric, the result of experience. Now the empiric method in these matters has one grave defect. The secular empiric says that society and man need religion. But the religious empiric says (because he knows from all experience) that there can be no religion that is any use, spiritually or socially, unless the God is served for His own sake. Thus it is that, while it is true that man and society need religion to perfect themselves, it is also true that if religion be adopted in order to supply that need, there will be no real religion. And this is a more important truth for man and for society than the truth that they need religion. The argument from experience may suggest this, but it is an argument the full implications of which can only be seen and acted upon from within *religious* experience. God must be placed first, and this is so difficult to do that nothing less than a doctrinal and a disciplinary system can do it, a fact which is also well attested by experience. Religion, if it is not being constantly intensified in the individual and spread in society, does more harm than good. This fact deserves all the emphasis that the Marxists have given it. But it cannot be intensified or spread unless there be rationalization both in theory and practice. This is the point at which these writers break off their investigations and endorse those liberal errors which are so intimately connected with the evils they deplore. Each of these books is an antidote to the prevailing disease of conscience without convictions. But convictions, to survive and propagate themselves, should be rational convictions. A rational conviction involves discrimination, the exclusion of the worse in favour of the better. Does Mr Strachey really believe that Truth and Love are such fixed stars that the matter requires no further enquiry? Does Mr Mumford really think that anything so imprecise as his Grand Coulee Dam can prevent his social God from becoming an all-devouring Moloch? The problem is not to assert the primacy of the spiritual. The problem is to maintain it.

CAMBRIDGE. BRIAN WORMALD.

THE ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE OF NEW TESTAMENT BAPTISM. By H. G. Marsh. Manchester University Press. 7s. 6d.

The absence of books on Holy Baptism constitutes an aching void in modern theological literature, and it is to be hoped that this is the first of many that will help to meet the need that exists. Mr Marsh's book will satisfy only those who are thankful for small mercies. As the title implies, his attention is limited to

baptism in the New Testament, and even so he has a great deal more to say about origins than significance.

With regard to the former, he covers the ground fairly thoroughly. He passes in review and correlates all the N.T. references to the subject, and discusses dispassionately and with some needless repetition the many critical problems to which they give rise. Part I deals with " The Rite of John the Baptist ", and Part II with " Early Christian Baptism ". Mr Marsh holds that Christian baptism is a development from the Jewish tebilah through the Johannine rite, and he makes out a strong case for this conclusion. But the chief value of the book lies in his assembly of references to the works of modern New Testament scholars. He has ransacked the commentaries, and to a less extent the periodicals, for both enlightening and darkening suggestions. There are, indeed, culpable oversights; for example, when he states that " immersion was probably the customary form of baptism " he fails to take into account what Professor Clement Rogers has written on this question. Still, we are provided with what may be described as " a critical apparatus " which will be indispensable for further investigation of the subject.

It is in its treatment of the significance of New Testament baptism that the book is most disappointing. Mr Marsh solemnly asserts that it is impossible to find in the New Testament " a completely coherent and logical system " of doctrine. Who does suppose that this is possible ? The question is: Does the New Testament, when the literary and historical critics have done their work upon it, confront the student with certain definite theological themes which have a profound, though not strictly logical, coherence ? Anyone who claims to write on the significance of New Testament baptism ought to provide a much clearer and fuller answer to this question than Mr Marsh attempts. He does, of course, produce some relevant hints or pointers, but these never seem to be his main concern.

His style is rather tedious and diffuse, but unhappily there is nothing unusual in that. The proofs must have been carelessly read. The number of misprints is surprising in a book which comes from a University Press. Words ending in -ize or -ise are spelt indiscriminately with " s " or " z "; *e.g.*, on p. 44 there is one sentence which contains both " recognising " and " recognize." On p. 104 we read " adoptianist " and " adoptianism."

A. R. Vidler.

Hawarden.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher